

Emma Matzat

EMMA MATZAT
5235 SO. 350 W.
NORTH JUDSON, IN 46366

HISTORY OF DOGMA IN FOUR VOLUMES

BY

PETER J. DOESWYCK, D.D.

Author of Ecumenicalism and Romanism

Volume I: Ecumenicalism and Romanism,
Their Origin and Development"
Long Beach, 1961. - Cloth \$3.00.

Volume II: "The Ever Changing Church,
Its Origin and Development"
Long Beach, 1962. - Cloth \$3.00.

Volume III: "The Roman Way of Salvation,
Its Origin and Development"
To be released soon.

Volume IV: "Roman Customs and Practices,
Their Origin and Development"
To be released soon.

Knights of Christ, Inc.
P.O. Box 1651
Long Beach, California

HISTORY OF DOGMA

volume two

THE EVER CHANGING CHURCH

Its Origin and Development

A History of the Doctrines and Practices of the Roman Catholic Church, Based on the Original Sources of the Middle Ages, Presented especially for the Benefit of Those who Contemplate Merger with Rome

BY

PETER J. DOESWYCK, D. D.

Author of Ecumenicalism and Romanism

Knights of Christ, Inc.
P.O. Box 1651
Long Beach, California

Printed in the United States

Copyright 1962
by
Peter J. Doeswyck

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 62-15129

All rights reserved. No part of this book protected by the above copyright
may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publisher.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.....	7
CHAPTER II. THE MASS	31
CHAPTER III. MASS STIPENDS	72
CHAPTER IV. TRANSUBSTANTIATION	83
CHAPTER V. DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.....	108
CHAPTER VI. DOCTRINE OF PROBABILISM....	110
CHAPTER VII. IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF MARY	112
CHAPTER VIII. ASSUMPTION OF MARY.....	123
CHAPTER IX. HAIL MARY	128
CHAPTER X. ROSARY	130
CHAPTER XI. SCAPULARS AND MEDALS.....	137
CHAPTER XII. SACRED HEART WORSHIP.....	146
CHAPTER XIII. NOVENAS AND FIRST FRIDAYS..	149
CHAPTER XIV. STATIONS OF THE CROSS.....	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY	159

CAVETE AB HOMINIBUS: TRADENT ENIM VOS IN
CONCILIIS. (Matt. 10:17)

Meddle not with them that are given to change. (Prov. 24:21)
For I am the Lord, I change not. (Mal. 3:6)
Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today, and forever. (Heb.
13:8)

CHAPTER ONE

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS

DID CHRIST INSTITUTE SEVEN SACRAMENTS?

The word *Sacrament* is a pre-Christian Latin word (*Sacramentum*: 'sacred-ment') which originally meant "something sacred", i.e. something pertaining to the temple, but soon received the meaning of taking an oath of allegiance before the altar of God. Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) uses the word *Sacramentum* in the meaning of taking an oath (*Migne, P.L. 77, 572*). Pope John VIII in 873 speaks of the oath as "the Sacrament" (*Baronius, Annales, A.D. 873; vol. 15, p. 269*). The oath of fealty sworn by the British subjects to King Edmund II (d. 1016) is called a Sacrament (*William Stubbs, Select Chapters; Oxford, 1900, p. 67*). Sigebert of Gemblours (d. 1112) uses expressions as: "to confirm this with a sacrament" (*Chronica, A.D. 1033; Migne, P.L. 160, 206*). John of Salisbury (d. 1180) uses the word "Sacrament" for the military oath of the knights, because the sword was offered to the knight at the altar (*Migne, P.L. 199, 599*). At the Council of Lyons (A.D. 1274) the oath of the Emperor is called "*Sacramentum Imperatoris*" (*Mansi 24, 73*). What Rome called a sacrament for a thousand years, has now become an every day courtroom affair for which the presence of the clergy is no longer required. We see, therefore, how changeable Roman traditions are.

In spite of the fact that the word "sacrament" had the meaning of swearing before God, it would seem that the vows connected with the rites of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Priesthood and Monastic Profession did not contribute to the *multa sacramenta* theory of the 11th century. It was the Final Schism of 1054 which freed the Latin Church from Greek domination and which contributed to a change in definition of the word Sacrament. Before 1054 the word Sacrament was a rather poor Latin translation of the Greek word Mystery. When the word Sacrament became synonymous with "church rite", the number of sacraments increased as the number of church rites increased.

The Bible speaks of Baptism (*Rom. 6:4*) and of the Lord's Supper (*I Cor. 11:20*), but it does not classify them under a technical term, such as Sacraments. The Latin word Sacrament logically cannot be found in a Greek Bible. The word Sacrament was introduced into the church by Bishop Tertulian (d. 230), the founder of Latin Christianity, as a translation for the Greek word Mystery. The early Church of Rome used the Greek language and it used the word *Mystery* till the fifth century.

The second-century Church spoke one language: Greek. The church services were called "mysteries" (plural). The Bible calls the Christian ministers "the stewards of the mysteries of God" (*I Cor. 4:1*). Especially the closed communion services, from which all non-members were barred, became known as the Mysteries (Sacramenta). The early Latin rituals were called "Liber Sacramentorum", the book of the Sacraments. They contained the liturgy for the daily Agape and the liturgy of Baptism which was administered on Easter and Pentecost. In the meaning of a secluded fellowship or communion the Bible even speaks of the oneness of husband and wife as "a great mystery" (*Eph. 5:32*), which the Latin Bible translates as "Sacramentum hoc

magnum est".

At a very early date the Christian Church began to use oil (Chrism) in its baptismal rites to symbolize the power of the Holy Spirit. Baptism came to consist of two parts: water and chrism, even as the Eucharist consisted of two elements: bread and wine. This baptismal anointing was not considered to constitute a separate Sacrament, nor is it to be confused with the late invented Sacrament of adult Confirmation. In view of the fact that the Roman Church used the Greek language exclusively for three and a half centuries it is interesting to note that "Baptisma" (*Dipping; Rom. 6:4*), "Chrisma" (*Anointing; I John 2: 20 & 27*), and "Eucharistia" (*Thanksgiving; II Cor. 9: 11 & 12*) are Greek words, while the late Sacraments of (1) Confirmatio, (2) Penitentia, (3) Ordo or Ordinatio, (4) Matrimonium, and (5) Extrema Unctio are Latin names.

The Ecumenical or Catholic Church (Union of East and West, 325–1054 A.D.) believed in two Sacraments: Baptism and Communion. The Roman Catholic Church in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries increased the number of sacraments by calling every church rite and every article of devotion a Sacrament: profession of monks, foot washing, candles, holy water, Easter lambs, etc. The political Council of Lyons in 1274 limited the number of sacraments to seven. This council did not end the *multa sacramenta* controversy, because the theologians continued to argue whether there were seven or more Sacraments (*septem vel plura sacramenta*). The Council of Florence (1439) ended the controversy by officially adopting seven Sacraments for East and West. The Council of Trent (1545–1563) made this teaching a dogma of faith.

The Baltimore Catechism teaches: "There are seven Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony . . . A Sacra-

ment is an outward sign, instituted by Christ to give grace." In the most unscientific manner Rome first ruled on the number of Sacraments and later drew up a definition for a Sacrament. A Sacrament now requires (1) an outward sign or "matter" like water, bread, etc., (2) some ritualistic words or "form", (3) a minister to perform the rite, (4) the right intention of the minister, (5) the automatic production of the signified grace ("ex opere operato") and (6) the institution by Christ (which reduces all rites which were instituted by the Church to minor sacraments or sacramentals).

William of Auxerre (d. 1223) is said to have been the first Roman Catholic theologian to discover or invent the sacramental "matter" (materia) and "form" (forma) (see *C.E.* 13, 298). The bond of matrimony has no other outward sign than the wedding ring which is of pagan origin and which was not used before the seventh century. Peter of Poitiers (d. 1215) and Pope Innocent III (d. 1216) are said to be the first ones to speak of "ex opere operato" (see *C.E.* 13, 297). The Council of Trent (1545–1563) is the first council to make the doctrine of Seven Sacraments, the Intention of the Minister, and the Institution by Christ dogmas of faith. "In Trent for the first time its institution by Christ Himself was defined" (*C.E.* 5, 716).

St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), who still held that "a Sacrament is a sacred secret" (*Summa, Part III, Qu. 60, A. 1*), did not teach that Christ is the sole Institutor of Sacraments or church rites. St. Albert the Great (d. 1280), the professor of Aquinas, taught that Matrimony "was instituted in Paradise" (*Opera Omnia; Munster, 1958; vol. 26, p. 158*). Pope Alexander III (Roland, d. 1181) taught that the Sacrament of Confirmation "was instituted by the Apostles" (*Book of Sentences; Freiburg, 1891, p. 213*). Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141) taught that Confirmation had its origin in the Old Testament; that the anointing of the sick "was instituted

by the Apostles"; and that the Sacrament of Matrimony "was instituted even before sin" (*Hugo, On the Sacraments; Migne, P.L. 176, 442–580*). Bishop Bonizo of Sutri (d. 1089) taught that Christ Himself instituted only two Sacraments, while some others were instituted by the Apostles ("duo ab ipso Domino tradita, quaedam vero ab Apostolis instituta" *Migne, P.L. 150, 857; Muratori, Antiquitates, vol. 3, p. 599*). Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (d. 1146) taught that there were three major Sacraments: "Baptism, Chrism, the Body and blood of the Lord. Of these three, the first and the last we have received by the institution of the Redeemer Himself, while the one which we placed in the center is of apostolic tradition" (*H. Hurter, Patres, vol. 39, p. 58*). The famous Bishop William Durandus (d. 1296), Papal Secretary and liturgist, writes in his textbook on liturgy that Extreme Unction was instituted by Pope Felix IV: "For this reason some say that this is not properly a Sacrament like Chrism" (*Durandus, Rationale, bk 1, chapt. 8; Venice, 1568, p. 28*). Thus we see that the most prominent Italian scholars from the 11th to the 14th century were still unacquainted with the Tridentine clause of the sacramental definition: "instituted by Christ".

The Apostolic Fathers of the second century speak of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they have no knowledge of the sacramental system of the Council of Trent. Justin Martyr (c. 165) in his First Apology (Art. 61 & 65) speaks at length on Baptism and the Eucharist, but does not know of other "mysteries" (*Migne, P.G. 6, 419 & 427*).

St. Cyprian (d. 258), Bishop of Carthage, wrote a Catechism for Quirinus which has only two Sacraments: Baptism and Communion (*Migne, P.L. 4, 781*). "The sick" are merely "visited", not anointed (*Migne, P.L. 4, 807*). He calls Baptism "the Sacrament of faith" (*Migne, P.L. 4, 790*) while Communion is called "the Sacrament of the Lord's Cup"

(Migne, P.L. 4, 383).

The Council of Elvira (324) speaks of Penance, but it is instituted by the Church, not by Christ; nor is it called a Sacrament. This council allows no second repentance for mortal sins (*Mansi 2*, 7 & 9). Other councils forbid penance to the clergy. Marriage is permitted before Baptism (though it is the door of all Sacraments). All councils of the first thousand years deal with the duties of the clergy, the offices of the Church, the care for the sick, etc., but none speak of seven Sacraments.

St. Ambrose (d. 397), Bishop of Milan, Italy, wrote a book on the Sacraments and mentions only Baptism and the Lord's Supper. He calls them "Mysteries" (*Ambrose, De Mysterioris; Migne, P.L. 16*, 405). Later centuries forged a work under the name of Ambrose and gave it the title "De Sacramentis" (*Migne, P.L. 16*, 435-482). This forgery consists of six books, the first three dealing with Baptism, the last three dealing with the Lord's Supper. This forgery, for example, anachronistically speaks of the liturgical "Pater Noster" (Our Father) which Pope Gregory the Great added to the ritual in the year 600 A.D. (*Migne, P.L. 77*, 957).

Pseudo-Dionysius in his "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" (fifth-century forgery) speaks of three Sacraments. This numerologist concludes that, because there are three grades in the teaching church, therefore there are three Sacraments: Baptism, Chrism and the Eucharist (*Migne, P.G. 3*, 501; *P.L. 122*, 1096). This forger is so interested in juggling numbers that he splits the water and the oil of the fifth-century baptismal rites into two separate Sacraments. As a forger he could not be authorized to introduce a new doctrine.

St. Augustine (d. 430), the greatest and most voluminous of the Western Fathers, fails to speak on the number of Sacraments, except for his casual remark that they are "few in number" (*Migne, P.L. 42*, 355). His silence proves that

there were no controversies on this subject in his days.

The 'five' Sacraments of the Council of Rheims (630 A.D.) are spurious. They are listed as Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Matrimony and Extreme Unction (*Mansi 10*, 594-599). "Confirmatio" and "Extrema Unctio" as technical names for Sacraments are of Roman Catholic origin and were unknown in the seventh century (*see C.E. 5*, 716; *4*, 217). Seventh-century weddings in France did not even require a church blessing, and certainly were not classed among the Sacraments. A Sacrament was a sacred secret for members only. One became a member by Baptism. Any act, including matrimony, contracted before Baptism, could not be classified as a Sacrament.

St. Isidore (d. 636), Bishop of Seville, Spain, wrote his famous "Book of Sentences" which remained the theological textbook for Southern Europe for more than four centuries. In spite of the many interpolations by later copyists, he speaks only of two Sacraments: "Baptism and Communion" (*Isidore, Opera Omnia, by Migne; Paris, 1850, vol. 3*, p. 587). In his mutilated work "On Catholic Faith" we now find four Sacraments: "Baptism", "Chrism", "Sign of the Cross", and "the Sacrament of the Eucharist". His interpolated work "De Ecclesiasticis Officiis" has three Sacraments: "Baptism", "Chrism", and "Confirmation". As the Roman Church of today excludes Chrism and the Sign of the Cross from the Sacraments, even the mutilated text of Isidore has no more than three Western Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation and Eucharist.

The Sacramentaries of the 7th and 8th centuries speak only of two Sacraments. The Gelasian Sacramentary is officially called "The Book of Sacraments of the Roman Church by Saint Gelasius the First" (*Migne, P.L. 74*, 1055), though there was no Gelasius the Second till the 12th century. This ritual knows nothing of the modern sacra-

mental system of Rome. In his own "Epistles and Decrees" Pope Gelasius speaks only of Baptism and the Eucharist (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 9–190). The Leonine Sacramentary (*Migne, P.L.* 55, 21), the Gregorian Sacramentary (*Migne, P.L.* 78, 25), the French Ritual (*Migne, P.L.* 72, 89), the Spanish Ritual (*Migne, P.L.* 85, 109) and even the late Roman Ordines (*Migne, P.L.* 78, 937–1372) fail to reveal the doctrine of seven Sacraments.

A ninth-century British Penitential, falsely attributed to St. Egbert (d. 766), Archbishop of York (*C.E.* 5, 326), contains canons of priestly duties. Only Baptism and Communion are mentioned (*canon 10 & 20; Migne, P.L.* 89, 381). The dying receive Communion, not Extreme Unction (*Migne, P.L.* 89, 382).

The six Sacraments of St. Theodore Studita (d. 826) are spurious. We purposely mention all the spurious sources so no one may mislead our readers into believing that the *multa sacramenta* theory existed before the Final Schism (1054). In Theodore's Epistles (*Bk 2, Ep. 165*) we now read: According to apostolic tradition there were instituted "six mysteries: (1) illumination, (2) synaxis or communion (3) consecration of oil, (4) consecration of priests, (5) profession of monks, (6) rite for the dying" (*Migne, P.G.* 99, 1523). Those who like to deny that this epistle is spurious must at least admit that St. Theodore was wrong in maintaining that the Apostles believed in six Sacraments, and that the monastic vow was one of them. 'Christian' Monasticism originated in the fourth century. Catholic authors must further admit that all other ninth-century authors were unacquainted with Theodore's list of Sacraments, though this century produced greater scholars than any other period between the fifth and thirteenth centuries.

The contemporary Photius (d. 897), Patriarch of the East and the greatest scholar of this era, knows only two Sacra-

ments: Baptism and Eucharist ("*Syntagma Canonum*", *Migne, P.G.* 104, 615–635). Pope Leo IV (d. 853), who abolished the daily celebrations and forbade his clergy to accept stipends for the Sacraments, knows only two Sacraments: Baptism and Eucharist (*Canon 29 & 39; Migne, P.L.* 115, 679 & 681). Rabanus Maurus (856), Archbishop of Mainz, Abbot of Fulda, Primate of Germany and the greatest scholar of the Holy Roman Empire of this era, wrote "On the Sacraments of the Church": "For the Sacraments are: Baptism and chrism, the Body and blood; which are called Sacraments for this reason, because under the cover of corporal things the divine power secretly operates" (*Migne, P.L.* 112, 1168). This 'Summa' of Rabanus remained the official textbook in the Holy Roman Empire for three centuries. If it contained heresy, the bishops of Rome were not aware of it.

Florus of Lyons (837) explains the new German "Mass", but has nothing to say about a change in the number of Sacraments (*Migne, P.L.* 119, 72). Amalarius of Metz (9th cent.) gives every detail of all liturgical practices and clerical duties in his *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*. He mentions the new German 'Palm Sunday' (without blessing of palms), the new practice of blessing candles, and he speaks at length about the Eucharist (*Migne, P.L.* 105, 1008 & 1033 & 1153). He does not mention any new Sacraments.

The ninth century produced the first eucharistic controversies. Ratramus, a learned priest of the French Monastery of Corbie, held the symbolic view, but his superior, Abbot Paschasius Radbertus, defended the Real Presence. Yet both agreed on the number of Sacraments. Ratramus wrote: "For the Sacraments are Baptism and chrism, and the Body and blood of the Lord" (*Migne, P.L.* 121, 146). Paschasius wrote: "For the Sacraments of Christ in the church are: Baptism and chrism and also the Body and blood of the

Lord" (*Migne, P.L. 120, 1275*).

Towards the end of the tenth century we find St. Ulrich (d. 973), Bishop of Augsburg and first saint canonized by Rome, speaking of three Sacraments. Father Migne does not have his complete works (*Migne, P.L. 135, 1071*).

Entering the eleventh century, we reach the great German theologian, Bishop Burchard of Worms (d. 1025). His "Decretum" or Summa, which was a popular textbook till the Decretum of John Gratian (1150), consists of twenty books. His fourth book is entitled "On Baptism"; his fifth book "On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord". No other Sacraments are mentioned (*Migne, P.L. 140, 727*).

Having gone through some three hundred volumes of Migne, and having reached the Final Schism between East and West (1054), we still have not reached the era of *multa sacramenta* (many sacraments), nor have we found any dispute about their number. We must, therefore, conclude that for one thousand years the Roman Church, like all other churches, believed that the baptismal rites and the Communion services were the only Sacraments of the Church, while the civil government employed the sacrament of the oath.

The era of Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII, 1073–1086) not only introduced the Papacy, Roman Catholicism, Celibacy, etc., but also the novelty of *multa sacramenta*. St. Peter Damian (d. 1072), whose "Book of Gomorrha" introduced Celibacy (*Migne, P.L. 145, 159*), and whose "Commentary on the Canon of the Mass" introduced the word "Transubstantiation" (*Migne, P.L. 145, 880*), is generally believed to have been the first human being to teach the existence of many sacraments (see K.S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity*; N.Y., Harper, 1953, p. 528). This does not mean that Peter Damian succeeded in changing the sacramental system in his lifetime. Few scholars read his books.

The learned historian and monk, Sigebert of Gemblours (d. 1112), speaking of the era of Hildebrand and Peter Damian, happens to mention the number of sacraments and writes: "The Sacraments which we have in the church are: Baptism and chrism, and the Body and blood of Christ" (*Migne, P.L. 160, 217*). He had evidently never heard of *multa sacramenta*, or ignored them.

The first genuine work which introduces more than two Sacraments and which seems to criticize the *multa sacramenta* of others, is "De Sacramentis" by the Italian Bishop Bonizo of Sutri (d. 1089). He writes: "The Church . . . has not received many sacraments (*multa non recipit sacramenta*). It has indeed few. Two have been instituted by the Lord Himself and some have been instituted by the Apostles" (*Migne, P.L. 150, 857*). After describing the Sacrament of Baptism and the Sacrament of the Eucharist, he briefly comments on the Sacrament of Salt and "the Sacrament of Oil". He writes "On salt and its power" (p. 862) which is no longer considered a Sacrament separate from Baptism, and he divides the Sacrament of Oil into three parts: (1) "Chrismal Oil", used in Baptism where it does not constitute a separate Sacrament; (2) "Oil of Exorcism" wherewith the Catechumens were anointed to ward off the Devil (both the Catechuminate and this special kind of Sacrament have been abolished); (3) "Oil of the Sick", which was used in any kind of sickness and which now has been abolished by the West or has been replaced by oil for the dying only (Extreme Unction). According to the Tridentine doctrine, Bonizo knew only of two Sacraments which have been instituted by Christ, and two sacramentals: Chrism which developed into Confirmation, and the anointing of the sick which developed into Extreme Unction. Hence, this learned Roman Catholic Italian Bishop, who lived at the end of the eleventh century and whose famous writings are still in print, had never heard

of the Sacrament of Penance, the Sacrament of the Priesthood and the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Of the authors of the 12th century we have already mentioned Sigebert of Gemblours (d. 1112) who believed in two Sacraments. St. Yves (Ivo), Bishop of Chartres (d. 1116), the first Roman Catholic theologian to write a book "On the Primacy of the Roman Church" (*Migne, P.L. 161, 322*), still teaches two Sacraments. In his "Decretum" or Summa the first part treats on Baptism, the second part on the Body and blood of the Lord. No other Sacraments follow (*Migne, P.L. 161, 59–199*). Elsewhere in his Summa he treats on penance and weddings, but he does not treat them as Sacraments. The mere mention of penance and weddings can be found in any pagan religion, but does not prove that they were instituted by Christ as a means of grace.

The Italian Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (d. 1146) is the first theologian to accidentally arrive at the number of seven Sacraments. About the year 1120 he wrote a "Treatise on the true body of Christ" wherein he has a chapter on the Sacraments. This twelfth-century scholar and personal friend of St. Bernard taught that Christ instituted only two sacraments; that Marriage and Priesthood are sacraments of the Old Testament and of minor importance, and he omits the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction altogether. Penance is not even listed as a *minor* Sacrament, not even as a nominal Sacrament:

"Three Sacraments we have in the church which not without reason are thought more worthy than the other sacraments, namely: Baptism, Chrism and the Body and blood of the Lord. Of these three, the first and last we have received by the institution of the Redeemer Himself, while the one which we placed in the center is of apostolic tradition. There are besides these, some others which seem like older Sacraments, namely: Priestly Ordination and lawful wedlock.

Sometimes the following are also called sacraments: the Sacrament of the Scriptures and the Sacrament of the Oath" (*Gregory of Bergamo, "Treatise on the true Body", chapt. 14; in H. Hurter, Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta, vol. 39, p. 58; in Union Theol. Sem. of New York*).

Gregory of Bergamo was not a simple layman or priest, but an Italian bishop and scholar. If he had never heard of the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, one can rest assured that the ten year old Pope Benedict IX or the four year old Archbishop Hugo of Rheims had never heard of them either. This bishop, who taught that Christ instituted only two Sacraments and who speaks of the Sacraments of the Bible and of the Oath, is quoted by Catholic authors as having taught the Tridentine doctrine of Seven Sacraments.

Father Bertrand Conway, for example, in his "Question Box" states: "The seven Sacraments are mentioned by Otto of Bamberg (1127), Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (1133–1146), by Paululus of Amiens (1150), and by Roland, afterwards Pope Alexander III (1159–1181)" (*Conway, Question Box, p. 234*). My reader now knows that Gregory did not mention "the" seven Sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, and, therefore, my reader now knows that Father Conway is either uninformed or outright dishonest, or both. Father Conway further uses the old trick of implying that the mere mention of the word Penance proves that it was considered a Sacrament. Out of a blue sky he mentions four authors of the twelfth century without informing his readers that the first eleven centuries are silent about seven Sacraments. He further implies that no one can expect the Fathers of the Church to go to the trouble of drawing up "a complete list" of the Sacraments, though he must have heard that they drew up complete lists of every other subject: the canon of the Bible, calendars of feasts, canon laws, creeds, catechisms, martyrologies, penitential canons, libri pontificales, etc.

The Knights of Columbus go one step further. Without a shred of evidence they published in our Sunday papers: "There were Seven Sacraments for the early Christians — seven for Catholics the world over today," thus claiming that the Roman Church has remained "unchanged after nearly 2,000 years" (*KC ad, March, 1955*). While they repeat their falsehoods millions of times in our public newspapers, they try at the same time to prevent the modern *Galileos* from publishing the facts in book form.

Euthymius Zigabenus (c. 1122), an Eastern scholar famous for his "Dogmatic Panoply", knows only two sacraments (*Migne, P.G. 130, 1243–1274*).

St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni (d. 1123), believed in *multa sacramenta* because he made no distinction between Sacraments and church rites. In his *Summa* or "Book of Sentences" he has a chapter "On the Sacraments, Mysteries and Church Rites". Without saying which are Sacraments and which are mere church rites (like funerals), he lists nine: (1) Consecration of a church, (2) Salt, (3) Holy Water, (4) Oil, (5) Candles, (6) Baptism, (7) Confirmation, (8) Liturgical Vestments, (9) Consecration of bishops (*Migne, P.L. 165, 1091–1110*). Together with the Eucharist he has ten Sacraments, five of which are now classified as sacramentals. Like Gregory of Bergamo, this bishop has never heard of the Sacrament of Penance and Extreme Unction. Matrimony is also absent. The word "Confirmation" has been substituted for the original "Chrism".

The learned French priest and Canon, Alger of Liege (d. 1132), has three Sacraments: (1) Baptismal Water, (2) Oil of Chrism, and (3) "the Sacrament of bread and wine" (*Migne, P.L. 173, 761*). Peter Abelard (d. 1142), the father of scholasticism, taught two Sacraments (*Migne, P.L. 178, 1495–1540*). The Eucharist is still called "the Sacrament" (p. 981).

Otto of Bamberg (1139) is mentioned by Father Conway as one who taught the doctrine of Seven Sacraments. The Catholic Encyclopedia hesitates to subscribe to it: "According to some writers Otto of Bamberg (1139) . . . was the first who clearly adopted the number seven (see Tanqueray, "De Sacr."). Most probably this honour belongs to Peter Lombard (d. 1164)" (*C.E. 13, 299*).

Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141) is said to have taught *multa sacramenta* which are listed in the Catholic Encyclopedia (*C.E. 7, 523*). His "Summa Sententiarum" is really of a later date and "it is not the work of Hugh" (*C. E. 7, 523*). It lists: (1) Sacrament of Baptism, (2) Confirmation, (3) Sacrament of the Body and blood of Christ, (4) Water of Aspersions, (5) Reception of Ashes, (6) Blessing of Palms, (7) Candles, (8) Easter Lambs, (9) Sacrament of Wedlock, (10) Vows, (11) Confession, Penance and Remission of sins, (12) Unction of the sick (*Migne, P.L. 176, 442–580*). Not listed among his Sacraments, but treated elsewhere is a chapter "On Sacred Orders".

St. Bernard (d. 1153) acknowledged that there were many church rites, but he still defined a Sacrament as "a sacred secret" and enumerates three Sacraments: Baptism, the partaking of the Eucharist and foot washing (*Migne, P.L. 183, 271*).

British Cardinal Robert Pulley (d. 1153?) has no systematic treatise on the sacraments in his Books of Sentences, but he seems to have taught the popular four Sacraments of this new era: Baptism, Confirmation of children, Eucharist and the church-instituted rite of Penance (*see Bk 5, chapt. 24; Migne, P.L. 186, 838*). His *Summa* has clearly been revised.

Peter Lombard (d. 1164?), Italian Archbishop of Paris, in his Books of Sentences lists seven Sacraments: "(1) Baptism, (2) Confirmation, (3) the Blessing of the bread, that is: the Eucharist, (4) Penance, (5) Extreme Unction, (6) Orders,

(7) Wedlock" (*Migne, P.L. 192, 841*). It is this list of Lombard which Rome in later centuries adopted for the entire church. It took us eleven centuries before we found a theologian who taught the Tridentine list of seven Sacraments. The dispute about the number of sacraments is yet to come. Since the days of Robert Pulley (d. 1153?), Peter Lombard (d. 1164?) and Pseudo-Hugo (?) the Summas systematically treat on Penance after the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Pope Alexander III (Roland, d. 1181) treats on the Sacraments in his Book of Sentences (*not in Migne; "Die Sentenzen Rolands," Freiburg, 1891; in Urbana, Ill.*). He starts out with the Sacrament of "Incarnation" (p. 155). About the Sacrament of Confirmation this pope explains: "One must know that there are two Confirmations, one which is made on top of the head immediately after Baptism (about which nothing for the time being), the other is made on the forehead, about which these questions are raised: (1) By whom was it instituted? (2) Why? (3) What does it effect? and (4) by whom must it be administered?" He answered the first question: "It was instituted by the Apostles" (p. 213). It would seem that this pope still believed in *multa sacramenta*, and that he believed in four major Sacraments, because his caption above Penance reads: "After having written on the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Body and blood of Christ, we shall now direct our pen to treat on Penance" (p. 237). His theology on Penance is based on that of Peter Abelard. The new rite of Adult Confirmation, as distinct from the Chrism of children, is explained in the "Rationale" of John Beleth (1190) (*Migne, P.L. 202, 113*).

Many twelfth-century Summas of the West became conveniently lost, or have remained unpublished, like the "Speculum Universale" of Radulphus Ardens, the Summa of Bishop Robert of Hereford (d. 1167) (*see C.E. 13, 97*), many works of Cardinal Stephen Langton (d. 1228), and

others which may throw more light on the Sacrament controversies and on the mutilated texts of the published manuscripts.

The 13th century is the golden age of scholasticism, the era of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Albert the Great, and numerous other immortals. At the door of this era stands Peter of Piotiers (d. 1215), Chancellor of the University of Paris. His book "On the Mysteries of the Church" is an admitted forgery. So is his "Summa on the Sacraments". The fifth book of his Books of Sentences, which now contains the seven Sacraments of the Council of Trent (*Migne, P.L. 211, 1229*), is evidently spurious or has been re-edited. His third book had already spoken about the virtues, contrition, sin, punishment, confession, etc. If the head of the Catholic University had been pure in his teachings on the Sacraments, why were all these forgeries necessary? It is also very doubtful whether Peter of Poitiers was the originator of the expression "ex opere operato", and whether William of Auxerre actually originated the sacramental "materia et forma".

The records of the church councils show that the Church of England was the first to adopt Peter Lombard's number of seven Sacraments, and the first to list them in canonical form (*Council of London, 1237, A.D., canon 2; Mansi 23, 448*). Continental Europe was slow to follow. Its theologians wrote commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences of Peter Lombard, but refused to incorporate his Sacraments in their own Summas. The Dominican Saint, Raymond of Penafort (1235), lists seven Sacraments, but his Summa does not treat on them as an established unit. When giving the definition of a Sacrament he enumerates "Baptism, Chrism and the Body and blood of Christ" (*Raymond, Summa; Paris, 1720; in Univ. of Chicago*). The Franciscan monk, Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), wrote a commentary on Peter Lombard,

but the last volume of his own "Summa" (see *C.E.* 1, 298) is spurious (*Alexander, Summa*; Florence, 1928; in *Chicago Univ. and Marquette*). The Dominican, Albert the Great (d. 1280), teacher of Aquinas, wrote a commentary on Lombard, but does not mention seven Sacraments in his own Summa (*Albertus Magnus, Opera Omnia*; Paris, 1890, vol. 29; Munster, 1958, vol. 26; in *Marquette, U.S.C., and Urbana, Ill.*). The very question: "Whether there are seven Sacraments or more" (*septem sacramenta vel plura*; *Albertus, vol. 29, p. 6*) exhibits the controversy of this era. The Italian Franciscan, St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), wrote a Summa which deals with the Sacraments (*Bonaventura, Opera Omnia*; Florence, 1832; 11 vols.; in *Urbana, Ill.*). It seems clear that he taught "plura sacramenta", and that his conclusion: "Septem sunt et non plura" is spurious (*vol. 4, p. 53*). Some manuscripts do not have this chapter which clearly interrupts his treatise on Baptism (see *vol. 4, p. 47 & p. 61*).

St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), an Italian Dominican, wrote a Commentary on Lombard, but in his own Summa he followed Pope Alexander III: "Incarnation" (*Part III, Question 1-59*), "Baptism" (*Qu. 66-71*), "Confirmation" (*Qu. 72*), "Eucharist" (*Qu. 73-83*), "Penance" (*Qu. 83-90*). That's all. The Supplement to Part III is spurious: "Penance" (*Qu. 1-28*), "Extreme Unction" (*Qu. 29-33*), "Orders" (*Qu. 34-40*), "Matrimony" (*Qu. 41-68*). As Incarnation and Penance were not instituted by Christ, he actually believed in three major Sacraments. He wrote his Summa in Naples and finished it in 1273. He did not become ill so that another monk had to finish his work, but "he laid aside his pen and would write no more" (*C.E. 14, 665*).

The politicians of the West wanted the seven Sacraments of Peter Lombard canonized for the entire church and brought up the matter at the political council of Lyons (1274 A.D.). This Ecumenical Council, like the one initiated

by Pope John XXIII, sought merger between East and West at a time when the East was overrun by deadly enemies (then Turks instead of Russians) and had their backs to the wall. The fat, sexless Thomas Aquinas, who could make any opponent look like an illiterate, decided to attend this council in France. He never got out of Italy alive. On his way to the council, staying overnight at the Cistercian monastery of Fossa Nuova, Italy, he was poisoned on March 7, 1274. Rome denies that he was murdered, but admits that Thomas knew that he was dying and that he begged the illiterate monks for mercy, promising to retract his heresies. The great St. Bonaventure was poisoned during the Council, on July 15, 1274, a fact which Rome admits (*C.E. 2, 650*). The presiding pope dropped dead on his way from the council.

To understand the Eastern strategy at this Western Council one must know that from the fourth century till this day the Greeks have taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and that it is a heresy to say that He proceeds "from the Son also" (*filioque*). At the time of the First Schism (867) the Greeks had protested the fact that Spain had added the Latin "*filioque*" to the ancient Greek Creed. Rome itself had not added the *filioque* to the Creed till after the Final Schism (1054). In view of these historical facts anyone realizes the stunt the Greeks put over at the Council of Lyons by singing the liturgical "*filioque*" three times at the top of their voices. The Eastern Emperor, Michael Palaeologus, had sent Greek ambassadors to the council in order to secure Western military aid against the Turks. These men were not in the least authorized to sign a new religious creed (*C.E. 9, 477*). They feigned union "for political reasons rather than out of dogmatic persuasion" (*C.E. 11, 56*). This political council, which among other things deposed King James and replaced him with Rudolph, asked Gregory Acropolita to sign the agreements between East and West. Among these alleged

agreements is the so-called "Confession of faith of Emperor Michael Palaeologus" which enumerates the seven Sacraments of Peter Lombard. The document was drawn up so vague that any Greek could sign it. It did not say: By the authority vested in me by the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, I solemnly swear that the Greek Orthodox Church from this day forward shall teach the seven Sacraments of the West, but the document merely confirmed that "The same holy Roman Church also holds and teaches that there are seven ecclesiastical Sacraments, namely: . . ." (*Council of Lyons, 1274; Mansi 24, 71*). As soon as the council adjourned all its commitments were disowned by both the East and the West. The very council which supposedly had settled the controversy about the number of Sacraments, continues to call the oath of the Emperor: "Sacramentum Imperatoris" (*Mansi 24, 73*).

Rev. Martin Jugie, Roman Catholic expert on Greek Orthodox theology, who wrote five Latin volumes on "The Dogmatic Theology of Oriental Christians" (Paris, 1926–1935), observes: "It must be noted that the doctrine of seven Sacraments cannot be found in the Sacred Scriptures, nor in the traditions of the early centuries" (*vol. 3, p. 15*). He then maintains that since the second half of the 13th century the East confesses the doctrine of seven Sacraments, and that the confession of faith of Michael Palaeologus is the first authentic document which accepts the seven Sacraments (*vol. 3, p. 16*). As Christianity originated in the East and as it took the East thirteen centuries to discover the seven Sacraments, one naturally wonders how reliable non-biblical traditions are.

There is no evidence, either in the East or in the West, that the Council of Lyons (1274) settled the multa sacramenta controversy. The great Papal Secretary and liturgist, Bishop William Durandus (d. 1296), speaks of Extreme Unction and

Matrimony as if their classification as sacraments is still a legitimate question of debate. In a special chapter "On the Ecclesiastical Sacraments" he explains that Extreme Unction was instituted by Pope Felix IV and comments: "For this reason some say that this is not properly a sacrament like Chrism" (*Rationale, Bk 1, chapt. 9*). He further holds that private marriages are valid: "Although the solemnizing of marriages is prohibited during these seasons, yet at whatever time a marriage is legitimately contracted by words, it is valid" (*Rationale; Venice, 1568, p. 28*). Such Sacraments, as Penance, although in our time generally accepted, were then still in their early stages of evolution. Pope Innocent III (1215) had made private confession obligatory; Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) changed the general absolution (absolvi-mus, we absolve) into a private absolution (ego te absolvo, it is I who forgive you); and, if the recently found 'Pontificale' of Bishop Durandus is genuine, the remission text ("whose sins you shall remit") was first added to the Rite of Priestly Ordination at the very end of the 13th century.

The Eastern canonist, Matthew Blastares (c. 1332), in his "Syntagma" treats on Baptism, Matrimony, etc., without any apparent knowledge that these are related and belong to a certain category which produces grace *ex opere operato* (*Migne, P.G. 144, 1098*). Not until the 15th-century Ecumenical Council of Florence (1439) did the East debate whether there were seven Sacraments or more.

Just before the Council of Florence, when Thessalonica had been captured by the Turks, Archbishop Simeon of Thessalonica (c. 1430) introduced the Western number of seven Sacraments, and he proved his argument, not by Scripture, nor by tradition, but by numerology: "There are seven Sacraments of the Spirit because there are seven gifts of the Spirit, which are: Baptism, Chrism, Communion, Ordination, Wedlock, Repentance and Holy Oil" (*Migne, P.G. 155, 178*). The

Greek Orthodox Metropolitan, Joasaph (d. 1437), Archbishop of the biblical church of Ephesus, taught that the number of mysteries is not seven, but ten. Jugie's Latin translation of the text reads: "Ecclesiae sacramenta non sunt septem sed plura" (*Joasaph, Canonical Answers; Odessa, 1903, p. 38*). He enumerates them as follows: (1) Baptism, (2) Eucharist, (3) the rite of sacred Oil, (4) Consecration of priests, (5) Consecration of a church, (6) Matrimony before God, (7) the rite for the dying, (8) anointing of the sick, (9) Monastic profession, (10) Confession. He concludes: "These are the Sacraments of the Church".

At the Ecumenical Council of Florence (1439), where the West once more used the political and military misfortunes of the East as a means to effect a union, both East and West officially adopted the number of seven Sacraments. The agreement, known as the Decree for the Armenians on the Seven Sacraments, was published in the Bull "Exultate Deo" of Nov. 22, 1439 (*Mansi 31, 1054*). Latourette holds that "It was not until 1439 that their number was finally officially fixed" (*History of Christianity, p. 528*). The Catholic Encyclopedia, speaking of the new definition of the Sacraments, explains: "The new terminology . . . was solemnly ratified by . . . the decrees of the Council of Florence (1439), yet has not the value of a conciliar definition" (*C.E. 13, 298*). Speaking of the Sacrament of Matrimony, the same source explains: "In Trent for the first time its institution by Christ Himself was defined" (*C.E. 5, 716*). Hence, Rome had not fully settled the Sacrament controversy till after the Reformation.

Martin Luther (d. Feb. 18, 1546) and John Calvin (d. 1564) had already reduced the number of Sacraments to the biblical rites of Baptism (Rom. 6:4) and the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 11:20), the two mysteries or sacraments of the early church, when the Council of Trent in its 7th Session, on March 3, 1547, canon 1, made the number of seven Sacraments a

dogma of faith (*Mansi 33, 52*). The Lutherans extended to the East an invitation to discuss a merger, but Jeremias II in his "Answer to the Lutherans" insisted on keeping the number of seven Sacraments. The East had been so careful to avoid new doctrines and traditions, and it had boasted so much that it had preserved the faith once delivered to the saints, that it was afraid to confess to its own people that it had adopted the Roman number of seven Sacraments under duress.

In the 17th century Lukaris of Constantinople once more taught that Christ had instituted only two Mysteries. He had a large following, but the Councils of Jerusalem (1638 & 1672) condemned the movement and published a Catechism which taught the doctrine of Seven Mysteries. The Orthodox Catechism of Metropolitan Peter Mogilas (1643), approved by the Council of Jerusalem (1672), lists the seven Mysteries as follows: "Baptism, Unction of Chrism, the Eucharist, Repentance, the Priesthood, honorable Wedlock, and the Anointing of the Sick" (*Question 98*). The Larger Catechism of the Orthodox Church lists them in the same manner (*Moscow, 1839, Question 285*).

The differences between the Greek and Roman Sacraments are: The Greeks baptize by immersion and teach that the Western Baptism by pouring is invalid; the Greek priest administers Chrism during or after the rite of Baptism, a Mystery which has little in common with the adult Confirmation *en masse* administered by a Western bishop; the Greeks administer Communion like the Protestants, without the withholding of the cup; Greek priests do not claim the power of transubstantiating the elements, they do not worship the Host, they have no Benedictions of the Blessed Sacrament, they use ordinary bread, they have no "Mass" but a "Liturgy"; the East has no Sacrament of Penance (a fixed punishment), but the Mystery of Repentance (con-

trition); the Eastern priest denies that he has the power to forgive sins; the Eastern marriage can be dissolved by granting a divorce; the Eastern anointing of "the sick" is of different origin and for different people than the Western Sacrament "for the dying"; the Greeks call it *Euchelaion* and detest the name of Extreme Unction.

We have seen, therefore, that the Catholic sacramental system is one of gradual evolution. It did not exist during the first thousand years of Christianity. It was designed by medieval monks and States to gain complete control over its members from the cradle to the grave. The original rite of adult Baptism created the man-made office of the Catechumenate (pre-baptismal catechism; penitential discipline; excommunication till the hour of death). The Catechumenate created the distinction between venial and mortal sins (sins which can be pardoned and sins which cannot be pardoned). This new doctrine led to Second Repentances, Second Baptism, Confirmation, auricular confessions, redemptions, indulgences, Sacrament of Penance, indulgences for the dying, Extreme Unction, Purgatory, etc. Roman Catholic Cardinal Newman, after whom all Roman Catholic youth organizations are named, could hardly have taught that the Seven Sacraments are biblical when he described their "evolution" as follows: "Of the Sacraments, Baptism is developed into Confirmation on the one hand; into Penance, Purgatory, and Indulgences on the other; and the Eucharist into the Real Presence, adoration of the Host . . . The Mass and Real Presence are parts of one; the veneration of Saints and their relics are parts of one; their intercessory power and the Purgatorial State, and again Mass and that State are correlative; Celibacy is the characteristic mark of Monachism and of the Priesthood" (*John Henry Cardinal Newman, Development of Christian Doctrine; New York, 1949, p. 87*).

CHAPTER TWO

THE MASS

WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF THE WORD "MASS"? WHAT ARE THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES AND WHEN DID THE WORD "TRANSUBSTANTIATION" ORIGINATE? IS THE MASS A REAL SACRIFICE? IS THE ROMAN RITUAL THE OLDEST RITUAL? ARE PRESBYTERS REAL PRIESTS? WHAT IS THE "CONFITEOR" AND WHICH ARE THE OTHER PARTS OF THE MASS? WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF LOW MASSES AND SIDE ALTARS? DID THE MINISTER OF THE EARLY CHURCH FACE THE PEOPLE? WHEN WERE CANDLES AND CRUCIFIXES PLACED ON THE ALTAR? WHAT IS THE ELEVATION OF THE HOST? WHY IS LATIN THE LITURGICAL LANGUAGE OF ROME? WHEN DID THE MASS VESTMENTS ORIGINATE? IS IT TRUE THAT THE ROMAN MASS IS WITHOUT ERRORS? WHAT IS THE INCENSING OF THE ALTAR?

The word "Mass" (Latin: *Missa*) as a designation for the Sunday morning services seems to have originated in freshly converted Germany (8th Cent.) and to have been adopted by Italy and France in the ninth century. The converted Germanic tribes of the North introduced many new names to Christianity, such as Easter (goddess of Spring), Lent

(Spring), Flower Sunday (Palm Sunday), etc. The Germanic word "Messe" (celebration, feast), became translated into Latin as "Missa" and was later adopted by the Latin churches in spite of the fact that the old Latin word "Missa" does not mean a feast, but a "dismissal". Thus, "facere missam" (to make the dismissal) was changed into "celebrare missam" (to celebrate the Mass). The medieval names of feasts, like Christmas, Michaelmas, Martinmas, Petronillamas, etc., are not translations from the Latin "Missa Christi" (Nativitas Domini), "Missa Michaelis", etc., but have the historical meaning of the Feast of Christ, the Feast of Michael, etc.

The word Missa (Mass) is not biblical, nor is it a late Latin translation of an older Greek word. Even after Rome had abolished her Greek liturgy and had adopted the Latin language, she still did not use the word "Missa", but continued to use the Greek word "Eucharistia" (Service of thanksgiving) and the Latin translations: "Coena Domini" (Lord's Supper) and "Fractio Panis" (Breaking of the bread).

EUCCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION

The Fathers of the Church refused to discuss the Mystery of the Lord's Supper. Only from indirect remarks do we gather that the fourth-century Latin churches of Milan, Rome and Carthage (which is a small portion of the Ecumenical Church) leaned towards the theory of a symbolic presence. "St. Jerome, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine: these Fathers taught that the Sacrament of the Altar is the figure, the sign, the token of the body and blood" (C.E. 2, 488). The Catholic Encyclopedia, therefore, admits that fourth-century Rome did not believe in transubstantiation. The Ambrosian Ritual of Milan speaks of the bread "which is the symbol of the body" (quod figura est corporis; *Migne, P.L. 16, 462*). St. Augustine (d. 430), when explaining the method

of Bible interpretation, happens to mention that the eating of the Lord's body "is a figure of speech" (*figura est; Migne, P.L. 34, 74*).

Not until the ninth century did the Western theologians begin to discuss openly their views on the Lord's Supper. From these 9th-century controversies we learn that all Protestant views on the subject already existed, but the Roman Catholic views of transubstantiation and permanent presence were still unknown. Rabanus Maurus (Germany) taught the Real Presence (*Migne, P.L. 112, 1510*). Paschasius Radbertus followed Rabanus (*Migne, P.L. 120, 1267*), but was opposed by Ratramus (France) who believed in a Spiritual Presence (*Migne, P.L. 121, 125*). John Scotus Eriugena looked upon the Lord's Supper as a memorial supper (*Migne, P.L. 121, 403*). There are no papal pronouncements on the subject, because Rome was without learning. The French Deacon, Florus, opposed the view of the German Presbyter, Amalarius, yet both believed that they belonged to the same mystical body of Christ. Florus prayed: "That all who through this Mystery partake in Christ may become one in Him" (*Migne, P.L. 119, 51*). Amalarius explains: "As we are one bread in Christ, so we must also be of one heart" (*Migne, P.L. 105, 1153*). Catholic scholars admit that there was no unity of doctrine within the early Western Church. They admit that Ratramus explained that "there was no conversion of the bread" and that Eriugena held that the Lord's Supper was "a memorial" (C.E. 2, 487).

We lack the space to give translations of all ninth-century authors, but we would like to give a condensed translation of the treatise of Ratramus, because (1) it is the very first treatise of its kind, (2) it shows that the Lutheran and Calvinistic views on the Lord's Supper existed side by side 700 years *before* the Reformation, and, therefore, were not caused *by* the Reformation, (3) it is an official government

document of the Holy Roman Empire, (4) and it shows that France, which is the home of transubstantiation and Host worship, did not abolish her catechumenate and daily celebrations, and did not accept the Real Presence till the second Eucharistic controversies of the 11th century.

RATRAMUS (c. 805), PRESBYTER OF THE MONASTERY OF CORBIE, "ON THE BODY AND BLOOD OF OUR LORD" (*Migne, P.L. 121, 125-170*):

"To Charlemagne, the Emperor:"

Chapt. 1. "Thou hast demanded, O Glorious Prince, that I should give my opinion on the Mystery of the Blood and Body of Christ" . . . (p. 125).

Chapt. 2. "For while some of the faithful say concerning the body and blood of Christ, which is daily celebrated in the church, that nothing is done under a symbol (*figura*), nothing under a veil (*obvelatione*), but that it is performed by the naked manifestation of the fact (*truth*) itself; others, however, maintain that these things are present under the figure of the mystery (*sub mysterii figura*), and that it is one thing that appears to our bodily senses, but another thing that our faith beholds; it is clear that there is no small difference of opinion among them" (p. 128-129).

Chapt. 5. "Your Most Excellent Majesty asks whether the body and blood of Christ, which is received in the church by the mouth of the faithful, be such in mystery or in fact (*in mysterio fiat an in veritate*)" (p. 129).

Chapt. 7. "A FIGURE OF SPEECH (*figura*) is a certain mysterious manner of speech which exhibits, what it intends, under a certain veil; for example . . . when Christ says in the Gospel: 'I am the living bread (*manna*) which descended from heaven' (John 6:41); or, when He called Himself the *Vine*, but the disciples the *Branches*: 'I am the true vine, and thou art the branches' (John 15:5). In all these instances, one thing is said and another thing is understood" (p. 130).

Chapt. 8. "FACTUAL SPEECH (*"veritas"*, veracity) is the manifested demonstration of the thing itself, not veiled with any forms of obscurity, but expressed in pure and open and plain speech, in the natural meaning of the words; for example, when we say that Christ was born of a Virgin, suffered, was crucified, died and was buried. For here nothing is obscured by veiled figures; the fact of the thing (*rei veritas*) is expressed by the natural meaning of the words; nor do we understand here something else than what we say. But in the forementioned instances it is not so. For in substance (*substantialiter*), neither is Christ bread, nor is Christ a vine, nor are the Apostles branches" (p. 130).

Chapt. 9. "For if this Mystery is not performed under a figure, then it is not rightfully called a mystery, because we cannot speak of a Mystery (*"Mysterium"*, sacrament) when nothing is secret, nothing remote from our bodily senses, nothing covered with some veil . . ." (p. 131).

Chapter 10. "As no one can deny that these things are so, it is evident that the bread and wine constitute the body and blood of Christ figuratively (*figurate*)" (p. 131).

Chapt. 16. "Now this change (*commutatio*) is not wrought corporally but spiritually (*non corporaliter sed spiritualiter*); therefore we must necessarily say that it is wrought figuratively (*figurate*), because under the veil of material bread (*corporei panis*) and material wine is the spiritual body (*spirituale corpus*) and spiritual blood of Christ (p. 134-135).

Chapt. 19. "So also the body and blood of Christ, considered on the surface, is matter subject to change and corruption, but if we consider the efficacy of the Mystery, it is life conferring immortality on those who are partakers thereof" (p. 136).

Chapt. 27. " 'And He gave it to the disciples and said: This is My body' (Matt. 26:26). We see then that *before* Christ had suffered, the Mystery of his body and blood was already

partaken of" (p. 139).

Chapt. 29. "He said: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man . . . ' (John 6:53). He does not say that His flesh, which hung on the cross, should be cut in pieces and eaten by His disciples . . . for it would have been a crime for His disciples to have eaten His flesh and drunk His blood" (p. 140).

Chapt. 33. "Saint Augustine, an eminent Doctor of the Church, in his third book 'On Christian Doctrine' writes thus: 'Except ye eat', says the Saviour . . . He seems to command a shameful crime: therefore His words are a figure (figura)" (p. 141).

Chapt. 50. . . . "Does that what is seen, which is corporally received, chewed with the teeth, swallowed down the throat, and received into the belly, minister the substance of eternal life?" [Of course not].

Chapt. 97 "Your wisdom, Most Illustrious Prince, may observe how both by the testimony from the Holy Scriptures and from the Fathers it is most clearly demonstrated that the bread, which is called (appelatur) the body of Christ, and the cup, which is called the blood of Christ, is a figure of speech (figura), because it is a Mystery (mysterium)" (Migne, P.L. 121, 169).

We see, therefore, that the same arguments which the Presbyterians, Lutherans and Baptists bring forth today in support of their views, were brought forth more than a thousand years ago, but no one defended the Roman Catholic view of today. We cannot help noticing that the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire sought the opinion of a learned monk and not of a pope. Neither did Pope Leo III settle the question.

After the First Eucharistic Controversy (c. 800–850) Rome at once abolished the Catechumenate; it abolished its daily celebrations and ruled that Communion can be received only

three times a year (Migne, P.L. 115, 681); it changed the altar bread from ordinary bread (offered by the people) to unleavened or azyme wafers (matzoth) to which the East objected (Schism, 867); the custom of placing the bread in the hand of the communicant was changed into placing a particle of the wafer directly in the mouth; it abolished the daily gatherings of the old Agape and limited the services for the laity to Sunday mornings (Pope Leo IV, d. 853; Migne, P.L. 115, 677.)

✓ The "Mass" is a new name for a new service: a Sunday morning worship without Communion services for the laity. During the first eight centuries Rome dismissed the Catechumens (unbaptized converts and baptized penitents) right after the sermon, and held a closed Communion service for the faithful only. In the ninth century Rome abolished the dismissal of the Catechumens with the result that the new Mass became one continued service for saints and sinners alike. Before the ninth century only the saints offered their gifts (an altar collection of home baked bread and other gifts) to God and they recited the offertory prayers with the bishop. Ninth-century Rome abolished the offertory prayers till the 14th century when it composed a new prayer for the Mass-priest. Eventually Rome began to collect gifts and money offerings from the sinners also. The Catechumens used to be solemnly dismissed like the followers of Mithra with *Ite missa est* and *Kyrie* (5th to 9th century). It were the saints who dismissed the sinners with: "Lord have mercy on them" (Migne, P.G. 1, 1078; Mansi 8, 727). By the ninth century, Germany and Italy changed the *Kyrie* to: "Have mercy on us" (Migne, P.L. 105, 1113). Pope Leo IV (d. 853), who abolished the Catechumenate, introduced the "Asperges" (Migne, P.L. 115, 679) and began to sprinkle the sinners with Holy Water as they entered the door in order to prevent the Devil from entering the church with them (Migne, P.L. 125,

774; C.E. 7, 433). Before the ninth century all bishops, like St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, Pope Gregory the Great, etc., wore civilian clothes, but the ninth-century bishops of Germany and Italy began to wear the Mass vestment of the pagan priest (chasuble), first mentioned by Amalarius of Metz (*Migne, P.L. 105, 1095*), but falsely attributed to a third-century pope, St. Hippolytus, who since has been declared an anti-pope (*C.E. 10, 20*).

If France and Great Britain had immediately adopted the 9th-century Mass of the Holy Roman Empire (Germany and Italy), the Western Mass might have become a *priestly sacrifice* instead of *the people's sacrament* as early as the ninth century. France, however, refused to abolish the daily celebrations of the people until the 12th century (*Migne, P.L. 120, 1272; 121, 147; 161, 1090*). As long as France believed in a *symbolic* presence, her Mass could not have been a *real* sacrifice. As long as France barred sinners from Mass attendance, her Mass could not have been a sacrifice for sin.

In Communion services we must distinguish the Communion from the services. The services may last an hour, while the Communion itself, the actual eating of the altar bread, may last a few minutes. In the days of the Agape and daily celebrations the service was called the Eucharist, and the altar bread was called "the oblation" or "the sacrifice", because it constituted the "offering" (collection) of the people. Later the service was called a sacrifice, and the altar bread came to be known as the Eucharist or the Host. The Council of Gangra (c. 350) speaks of receiving Communion as "to partake of the oblation" (*Mansi 2, 1102*). Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) calls the offering of the gifts by the people (collection) "sacrificium offere" or "oblatio sacrificii", i.e. the offering of the bread (*Migne P.L. 54, 626*). The Roman Penitential, published after the abolition of the first penitential system (c. 850) reads in chapter 10, canon 1: "If anyone

does not well guard the sacrifice (Qui non bene custodierit sacrificium), and if a mouse eats it, he shall do penance" (*Migne, P.L. 105, 701*). In the early Middle Ages the word "sacrifice" referred to the spiritual and material offerings of the people, and not to the real sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Because of this confusion of terms, dishonest theologians can easily make people believe that the Sacrifice of the Mass existed in the early centuries.

During the first part of the 11th century the French scholars were still teaching the symbolic presence, but the civil authorities were pressing for the teaching of the real presence. Pope Sylvester II (Gerbert, d. 1003), St. Fulbert (d. 1028), and Berengarius (d. 1088) were successively the Heads of the French schools of theology, one being the pupil of the former in the order listed (*C.E. 3, 14; 6, 312*). Pope Sylvester wrote a treatise on the Eucharist: "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini" (*Migne, P.L. 139, 179-188*), the text of which has been so mutilated and condensed that it is no longer the work of a scholar. His pupil, St. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, has left us a treatise "On the Body and Blood of Christ" (*Migne, P.L. 141, 334-335*). He expounds the symbolic presence of St. Augustine and quotes the Saint verbatim: "... Therefore it is a figure of speech". A later copyist falsified the text by adding the interpolation "(says the heretic)", thereby changing a Saint into a heretic. Only one manuscript (ed. by Petavius) has this interpolation. As the mutilated text now reads, St. Fulbert would have given only the heretical view of the Sacrament and would have neglected to give the right view. His pupil, Berengarius, Bishop of Tours, continued to teach the symbolic presence, and published the book "De Sacra Coena" (On the Holy Supper) which opposed the real presence of Germany and Italy.

In 1054 Rome separated from the East (Final Schism) and

terminated the second Eucharistic Controversies by imprisoning Berengarius, the leading theologian of France (1059), and by establishing the "conversion theory" (forerunner of transubstantiation) throughout the West.

Till the 11th century both Rome and France had maintained the "Bishop's Mass" (concelebration), but as soon as Roman Catholicism had been established the presbyters became Mass-priests. The East never adopted the word "Mass", nor abolished its concelebrations. Pope Alexander II (1063) allowed presbyters to say Mass if, like the bishops, they were without wives and concubines (*Migne, P.L. 146, 1289*). As the British presbyters were still married, the Council of Winchester (1076) decreed: "That in churches no Masses are to be celebrated except by consecrated bishops" (*Mansi 20, 460*). Canterbury attempted to abide by the one thousand year old rule of St. Ignatius: "Without a bishop it is not permitted either to baptize or to celebrate the Agape" (*Migne, P.G. 5, 714*). By the end of the 11th century Great Britain gradually began to allow celibate presbyters to say Mass. By new canon law, wrongly attributed to Archbishop Alfred, England had to explain the new office of the Elder: "Presbyterus est Sacerdos Missalis", an Elder is a Mass-priest (*Migne, P.L. 139, 1473*).

During the reign of Pope Hildebrand (1087) some sort of transubstantiation (conversion of the bread) had become the accepted doctrine for the West (*Migne, P.L. 145, 880; 171, 1153*). The Mass now became a real sacrifice, and its minister became a real priest. As a real sacrifice requires a real victim, the altar bread now received the new name of "Host" (*hostia*, victim, sacrifice). The Catholic Encyclopedia explains: "Before the tenth century the word 'host' was not employed, because before that time the Blessed Eucharist was considered more frequently as a Sacrament than as a Sacrifice" (*C.E. 1, 350*).

Twelfth-century France invented the Mass Intentions and began to sell the new sacrifice for a silver denarius. French theologians, like Peter Cantor (d. 1197), vigorously protested the "selling of Christ" and called it a crime worse than that of Judas ("turpius quam Juda"; *Migne, P.L. 205, 99*). This new commercial angle of the sacrifice led to the multitude of Masses said by one priest on the same day ("piety for money"), until the 13th century limited the presbyter to one paid Mass a day (*Mansi 23, 514*). The evolution of the Mass does not end here, but is just beginning. We will continue the subject when we treat on the origin of Low Masses, Missals, side-altars, etc.

ORIGIN OF THE NAME "MASS"

"The word Mass (*missa*) first established itself as the general designation for the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the West after the time of Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604)" (*C.E. 10, 6*). The expression "the Sacrifice of the Mass" was unknown to such famous Italian Fathers as Bishop Ambrose of Milan (d. 397), St. Jerome of Rome (d. 420), Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) and Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604). Even such expressions as "celebrating Mass", which are now found in the works attributed to Gregory the Great (*Migne, P.L. 77, 641*), came from the hand of later editors.

The first author to write a book on the "Mass" is Florus (837), the Deacon of Lyons, who wrote "Expositio Missae" (*Migne, P.L. 119, 58*). As Lyons is in France, his Mass is still a daily celebration with the dismissal of the Catechumens before the Offertory. During the 11th and 12th century the number of books on the Mass increased: Peter Damian (d. 1072) "Expositio in canonem Missae" (*Migne, P.L. 145, 880*); St. Odo (1113) "Expositio in canonem Missae" (*P.L. 160, 1060*); Hildebert of Tours "De expositione Missae" (*P.L. 171, 1154*). By the middle of the 12th century we find

Alger of Liege who is the first to call his book: "The Sacrifice of the Mass" (*Migne, P.L. 173, 854*).

The word "missa" is an old, pre-Christian Latin word which means dismissal. Though the common Latin word had changed into "dismissio", the word *missa* had survived in the pagan services of Mithra. The Latin churches adopted the word "missa" for their church dismissals, but the early Fathers never used this word to designate the entire service. St. Augustine (d. 430), explaining the fifth-century service of Africa, writes: "After the sermon the dismissal of the Catechumens (*missa catechumenorum*) takes place; the faithful remain" (*Migne, P.L. 38, 324*). The Apostolic Constitutions explain the dismissals in detail (*Migne, P.G. 1, 1078*). Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) was the first to allow two dismissals on Christmas and Easter in order to give all people a chance to offer their gifts: "When any of the greater festivals has brought together a larger crowd than usual. . . for one church to hold them all at one time, there should be no hesitation about repeating the offering of the bread (*sacrificii oblatio*), lest . . . some people would be deprived of their worship, if the custom of only one dismissal is preserved (*si unius tantum missae more servato*), and if only those who came early in the day could offer the bread (*sacrificium offere*)" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 626*). Thus by official papal decree or Roman canon law (*Leo, Ep. 9, canon 2*) it has been established that in the fifth century the word "missa" meant *dismissal* and the word "sacrificium" meant the bread or gifts offered by the people, that is, the old 'offertory' which is now called 'the collection'.

St. Isidore, 7th century Spanish Primate, wrote: "The dismissal (*missa*) takes place at the time of the offering (*tempore sacrificii*), when the Catechumens are sent out . . . because they may not be present at the Sacrament of the Altar" (*Migne, P.L. 82, 252*). Hence, in the seventh century the expression "Sacrificium Missae" would have been a con-

tradiction in terms, because the *Missa* (dismissal) was instituted to prevent sinners from attending the *Sacrificium* (offering). Neither did the expression of "missing Mass" exist in the seventh century, but the Council in Trullo (692) speaks of "missing church" (*Mansi 11, 978*).

Florus of Lyons, a 9th-century Deacon of France, adopted the Holy Roman Empire's new custom of calling the whole service a *Missa* (Mass), but as France had not abolished her dismissals he was unable to explain the German "Messe" satisfactorily: "Mass, therefore, means nothing else than dismissal (*Missa ergo nihil aliud inteligitur quam dimissio*) . . . Therefore the dismissal of the catechumens (*missa catechumenorum*) takes place *before* the partaking of the Sacrament; the dismissal of the faithful (*missa fidelium*) takes place after the partaking" (*Migne, P.L. 119, 72*). Though Florus was a greater theologian than his bishop, he merely assisted the latter during "Mass".

St. Ivo or Yves (d. 1116), Bishop of Chartres, decreed: "The Bishop shall not prohibit anyone, whether he be a heretic or a Jew, to enter the church and to hear the Word of God until the dismissal of the catechumens (*usque ad missam catechumenorum*)" (*Migne, P.L. 161, 1090*). This decree shows not only that France preserved the catechumenate till the 12th century, but also that bishops, not presbyters, presided over the communion services.

IS THE MASS A 'REAL' SACRIFICE?

The modern Roman Mass is called a sacrifice for sin, "a real sacrifice in itself", "the same sacrifice as that of the cross", "without the Mass there would be no sacrifice in the New Testament" (*Baltimore Catechism, No. 3*). Roman Catholic author, James C. Conniff, concludes the description of the Mass: "Mass is over. Christ once more is crucified for us."

The Bible says that in the New Testament "there are no more sacrifices for sin" (*Heb. 10:18 & 26*), for Christ is now the only Priest and Mediator whose sacrifice on the cross need not, nor can it be repeated (*Heb. 9:25*), for he died "once for all", and saved men "to the uttermost", "forever" (*Heb. 7:25 & 27; 8:6; 9:12 & 15; 10:10*). Instead of the real sacrifices of old, the Christians offer to God spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, that is, prayers and material gifts: "Let us continually offer to God a sacrifice of praise (hostiam laudis) through Him, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name" (*Heb. 13:15*), "to offer up spiritual sacrifices (offere spirituales hostias) acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (*I Peter 2:5*).

Bishop Tertullian (d. 230), the founder of Latin Christianity, introduced the Latin word "sacerdos" (priest) as a translation of the Greek word "bishop", and the Latin word "ara" (altar) for the "table of the Lord". He used these Hebrew terms symbolically, for he did not believe in real sacrifices and a real priesthood. For this very view he is now called a heretic. The Apostolic Constitutions (4th–5th cent.) which contains the oldest Christian ritual, explains: "What in the olden days were sacrifices are today prayers and intercessions and thanksgivings. What formerly were the first-fruits, tithes, offerings and gifts, are now oblations which holy bishops offer to the Lord through Jesus Christ . . . These bishops are now your 'High-priests', even as the place of 'Priests' is now held among you by the Elders, and the place of 'Levites' is held by the Deacons" (*Migne, P.G. 1, 662*). Naturally, the Christian Elder was no more a real priest than a Deacon is a real Levite, or the offering of bread, wine and fruit is a real sacrifice.

Roman Catholic professor, Pohle, hiding behind the non-Catholic Harnack, dares to say this: "Harnack is of the opinion that the early Church . . . contented itself with the

purely spiritual sacrifices of the Mass . . . An impartial study of the earliest texts seems indeed to make this much clear, that the early Church paid most attention to the spiritual and subjective side of sacrifice, and laid chief stress on prayer and thanksgiving . . . That there has been an historical dogmatic development from the indefinite to the definite, from the implicit to the explicit, from the seed to the fruit, no one familiar with the subject will deny" (*C.E. 10, 11*). What more can we expect from a Catholic professor than to admit that during the 9th and 11th centuries a "dogmatic" change took place? To save his own skin he is forced to conclude his argument with double talk, that is, the old evolution theory which holds that the church gradually grew in knowledge. Such a theory not only ignores the power of the Holy Spirit, but it implies that the apostles did not know what the Lord's Supper was all about, and that its true meaning was first discovered by the medieval popes during 'the reign of the whores' (see *Doeswyck, Catholic Victory, 1960, p. 100*).

We have already mentioned that the late pagan name of "Mass" (dismissal) points out that the early services were spiritual offerings *by* the saints, and not real sacrifices *for* sinners. Furthermore, it seems inconsistent to ignore such biblical names as "Lord's Supper" and to name the Christian services after a pagan custom (Missa: dismissal) which was abolished precisely at the time when the Mass originated. We have also mentioned that the Latin churches could not have believed in real sacrifices as long as they did not believe in transubstantiation or the conversion theory. The 8th-century terms of "celebrating" Mass with a "Celebrant" points out that the occasion was thought of more as a feast than a repetition of a murder committed on Calvary. The prayers of the Mass itself are silent about transubstantiation and deny that it was meant to be a sacrifice. The "Kyrie",

for example, stresses "mercy" (Eleos) which is as much the opposite of sacrifice as grace is the opposite of works (*Matt.* 9:13). Throughout the Mass the priest recites prayers which could not refer to a Host-god, but which refer to the old spiritual gifts as "these things" (*haec dona, haec munera*) which we offer Thee as a token of our gratitude (*oblationem servitutis nostrae*).

RITUALS

The oldest Christian services are described to us by St. Justin Martyr (d. 165?) in his First Apology (*Migne, P.G.* 6, 427). It is a simple, biblical, Protestant Communion service, wherein the laity partake of both the bread and the wine. Neither the word "Mass", nor the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Agnus Dei or any other part of the Mass is mentioned. Just because it contains the biblical verse: "This is my body" (*Luke* 22:19; *Migne, P.G.* 6, 430), which the Roman Missal also happens to quote (*Hoc est corpus meum*), Catholic authors are not ashamed to assert that their Mass is mentioned as early as the second century. Cardinal Newman, however, maintains that St. Justin did not even believe in the real presence (*Newman, Development, 1949 ed., p.* 23).

The oldest ritual for Communion services is in the Greek language, dates from the beginning of the fifth century, and was added to the fourth-century forgery of the Apostolic Constitutions. The offertory prayer asks the Holy Spirit to look down upon the offerings of the people (bread and wine) "that He may show this bread as the body of thy Christ and the cup as the blood of thy Christ" (*ut exhibeat panum hunc corpus Christi tui, et calicem hunc sanguinem Christi tui; Migne, P.G.* 1, 1103; *Mansi* 1, 562).

The oldest Latin ritual to contain the offertory or canon did not originate in Rome, but in Milan. It is known as the Ambrosian Rite, and it dates from the end of the fifth or

the beginning of the sixth century. The people and the clergy prayed to God that through the power of the Holy Spirit "the bread may become the body and the wine the blood of Thy only begotten Son" (*ut fiat panis corpus et vinum sanguis Unigeniti tui; Migne, P.L.* 16, 462). Because the oldest Latin Offertory prayer plainly pointed out that the people offered their own gifts to God (altar collection), Rome decided to cut this prayer into numerous pieces and to spread its particles throughout her modern missal so that no priest would ever be able to understand its meaning. Roman Catholic professor, Adrian Fortescue, confesses: "Our Canon is not now in the form in which it was first composed" (*The Mass, p.* 170). "In the Roman Mass we find the Intercession scattered throughout the Canon" (*The Mass, p.* 111). "The Invocation was removed at Rome, apparently deliberately" (*The Mass, p.* 406).

ROMAN RITUALS

The oldest Roman rituals, the so-called Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries (*Migne, P.L.* 55, 21; 74, 1055; 78, 25) originated when the Holy Roman Empire came into existence. Like the "Apostolic" Greek Ritual (*Migne, P.G.* 1, 1103), these Latin rituals must also be termed forgeries, because they were falsely attributed to earlier popes (Leo, Gelasius and Gregory) and have since been rewritten. Rome did not possess a Latin Ritual of her own prior to nor during the reign of Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604). When Rome finally and completely disowned her older Greek rites, she composed a Latin ritual modeled after the Latin rites of Africa and France (*Migne, P.L.* 72, 89). The early Spanish (*Migne, P.L.* 85, 109) and other national rituals, published by Father Migne, all bear a striking resemblance.

Throughout the Middle Ages the Western European countries continued to publish their own national rituals. The

Roman rituals or *Ordos* have been published by Father Migne (*Migne, P.L.* 78, 937–1372). The British rituals of the Middle Ages have been published in 73 volumes by the Henry Bradshaw Society of England (*London, 1891–1934; in Lincoln, Nebraska*).

After the Council of Trent, Rome abolished all national rites (except those of Milan, Italy; Toledo, Spain; and those used by the early monastic Orders), and she published her first “Roman Catholic” Ritual in 1570. This 16th-century Roman Ritual is still used today. This ritual was modeled after the early Sacramentaries in order to give it the appearance of great antiquity. Because of this, the modern ritual no longer fits the modern theology of Rome.

For the study of the history of the ritual one should read the “*De expositione Missae*” by Florus the Deacon, Peter Damian, St. Odo, Hildebert of Tours, Alger of Liege, etc., all of which can be found in Migne. Further treatises are “*De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*” by Amalarius of Metz and by many others; the “*Libri Poenitentiales*” of the Middle Ages; the “*Micrologus*” of Bernold of Constance and others; the “*Rationale*” of John Beleth and Bishop William Durandus; the more recent studies by Edmond Martene: “*De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*” (*Antwerp, 1763; 4 vols., in Chicago Univ. and Iowa City*).

PRESBYTERS OR PRIESTS?

Priesthood and Sacrifice are reciprocal terms. One cannot exist without the other. “Every priest (*sacerdos*) stands daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices (*hostia*) which can never take away sins. But this Man (Christ), having offered one sacrifice for sin, forever sat down” (*Heb. 10:11*).

The word “Priest” (Hebrew: *Kohen*) is mentioned in the Old Testament 730 times; the word “Sacrifice” (Hebrew:

Zebach) is mentioned 164 times. Entire books of the O.T. explain the Hebrew priesthood, its sacrifices and the priestly duties. In the New Testament Scriptures the word “Priest” (Greek: *Hiereus*) is mentioned 32 times, the word “High-priest” (*Archiereus*) 124 times. The entire Epistle to the Hebrews was written to explain the difference between the O.T. priesthood and the N.T. ministry, but it never mentions the “Mass” or a “Catholic Priest”. While mentioning the Highpriest of the Jews more than one hundred times, the New Testament never mentions the Pope. Whenever the word “priest” is mentioned in the Gospels or Epistles, it either refers to Christ (*Heb. 7:11*), to an O.T. Hebrew priest (*Heb. 9:6*), a contemporary Jewish priest (*Matt. 8:4*), or to a contemporary pagan Roman priest (*Acts 14:13*), but it never refers to a clergyman of the Christian religion. The word “priest” in the Book of Revelation (*1:6; 5:10; 20:6*) refers to a *spiritual* priesthood of all believers. The N.T. further mentions the word “priesthood”, four times referring to the Hebrew priesthood (*Hierosune; Heb. 7:11, 12, 14, 24*), and twice referring to the spiritual priesthood of all believers (*Hierateuma; I Peter 2:5, 9*). The words “sacrifice” or “offering” in the N.T. appear 29 times as “*thusia*” and 10 times as “*prosphora*”. The “*Eucharistia*” (*I Cor. 14:16*), that is, the prayers of thanksgiving, are the only sacrifices one can offer in the N.T. church (*Heb. 13:15*).

That an Elder (*presbuteros*) is not a Priest (*hiereus*) is clear from the Bible itself (*Mark 11:27*). The Bible divides the clergy into Elders and Deacons. There are no others. The Elder is sometimes called an “overseer” (Greek: *episkopos*, i.e., supervisor; *I Tim. 3:2 & 12; Phil. 1:1*) or a “pastor” (shepherd; *Eph. 4:11*). Peter calls the clergy “Elders” (Greek: *Presbuteros*) and calls himself a “fellow-Elder” (co-presbyter; *I Peter 5:1*), while he calls Christ the “Chief-pastor” (Latin:

princeps pastorum; *I Peter 5:4*). The word Elder (presbuteros) is the comparative form of *presbus*, old man. Hence it means an older man, that is, one of the first fruit of the faith. Once a church was well established and had many Elders, one was chosen to be the pastor or bishop of the church while the other Elders aided him in his ministry. Before the system of seminaries was established, a hierarchy was formed which graded the clergy into various orders or classes. From the 9th to the 11th century the bishops began to move into palaces and made themselves pastors of pastors (pastor pastorum) by delegating their powers to the lower clergy.

The Latin word for Elder is *Presbyterus* (Presbyter). The Latin word for Priest (sacrificer) is *Sacerdos*. The Latin Bible calls Christ a "Sacerdos" (*Heb. 7:11 & 24*), but never uses that word for the Christian clergy. The translation of the English Douay version: "call the priests of the church" (*James 5:14*) is wrong, because the Greek and the Latin Bibles have "Elders of the church" (*Presbyteros ecclesiae*). In the third century the Latin churches began to call the bishops "priests" (*sacerdotes*) and by the 11th century the presbyters became known as Mass-priests and were pronounced full priests in the 16th century. Consequently the words "Sacerdos" and "Presbyterus" create quite a confusion in Latin literature.

St. Bede (d. 735), for example, the great British historian and Bible interpreter, was not a bishop, has never been called a "sacerdos" and never offered a real sacrifice in his life. Till this day the Roman ritual refers to him as the "Venerable Elder" (*venerabilis presbyterus*; *Breviary, May 27*). In the same manner the ninth-century scholar, Amalarius of Metz, is never called a priest, but an elder.

Because the Anglo-Saxon Church used the Greek words "bisceop" (overseer) and "preost" (elder), the pagan Anglo-Saxon word for "sacerdos" (*Sacerd*) has disappeared from

the English language. Etymologically a "priest" (presbyter, elder) is not a priest (*sacerdos*, sacrificer).

Likewise the German "Priester", the French "Pretre", the Italian "Prete", etc., are words derived from *presbuteros*, elder. Therefore we should be slow to criticize the Greek Orthodox Church, the Anglican Church or the Scandinavian Lutheran churches for calling their clergy by the biblical name of "priest" (*presbuteros*). The Roman Church, however, is in error whenever she uses the Latin word "Sacerdotes" (*sacerdotes*) to designate her clergy. Even the Jewish religion realizes that the Rabbi is not a priest (*Kohen*) because there are no more sacrifices for sin.

In the medieval rites of the ordination of presbyters, the word *priest* (*sacerdos*) is never mentioned. Even the modern rite of priestly ordination still uses the word "presbyterus", and only one late interpolation of the text has the word "sacerdos". From the medieval rites of ordination we also learn the exact duties of the Presbyter. The early Latin churches forbade the presbyter to do penance. Pope Siricius (d. 399) decreed: "No clergyman is ever allowed to do penance" (*Clerico nullo conceditur poenitentiam agere*; *Migne, P.L. 13, 1145*). Pope Leo (d. 461) decreed: "It is contrary to the custom of the church that they who have been dedicated to the dignity of the Presbyterate or the rank of the Deaconate, should receive the remedy of Penance" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 1203*). Not only was the Latin presbyter unable to obtain absolution for himself, but he did not have the power to give it to others. The Council of Carthage (419) decreed: "Let no Presbyter . . . reconcile anyone to communion" (*Mansi 4, 424*). Amalarius of Metz (9th cent.), himself a presbyter, is the first to mention the German or Central European novelty of allowing presbyters to bless or to pronounce benediction (*Migne, P.L. 105, 193*). Pope Nicholas (864) condemned the practice and Rome did not

allow the Italian presbyter to bless till the 11th century, and forbade him to pronounce benediction till the 13th century. If the Roman Catholic Presbyter of Italy in the year 1059 was still forbidden to bless, it follows that he did not have the power to forgive sins, nor the duty to offer sacrifices for sin, and, therefore, was not a priest.

PARTS OF THE MASS

The modern Mass is a mixture of the old Gregorian Sacramentary (8th cent.) and the Roman Ritual of the 15th century. It is made up of prayers composed before the invention of transubstantiation and after the invention. All prayers borrowed from the older ritual refer to the offerings of the people, those borrowed from the 15th century refer to consecrated Hosts, i.e. Christ. The oldest prayers are in the plural: we the people; the latest prayers are in the singular: I the priest.

Introibo (15th cent.) . . . I will go unto the altar of God; *Confiteor* (11th to 14th cent.) . . . I will confess to Almighty God; *Credo* (11th cent.) . . . I believe in one God*); *Lavabo* (13th to 14th cent.) . . . I will wash my hands; etc., are priestly prayers, some adopted from the O.T. priesthood.

Gloria (6th cent.) . . . Laudamus te, we praise Thee, we bless thee; *Oremus* . . . Let us pray; *Orate fratres* . . . Pray, brothers, that my and your sacrifice may be acceptable; *Vere dignum et iustum est* . . . It is right that we should give thanks; *In primis* . . . In the first place we offer Thee these gifts; *Hanc igitur* . . . Accept this oblation of our servitude; *Supplices te rogamus* . . . We beseech Thee; *Pater noster* (7th cent.) . . . Our Father; etc. Even the absolution from sin is in the plural: "Indulgentiam . . . tribuat nobis

*) The original Creed was in the plural: "Credimus" . . . We believe (*Mansi* 2, 635). The oldest form of confession was in the plural: "We confess" (*Mansi* 14, 100).

Domine" . . . May the Lord grant us pardon; "Aufer a nobis . . . iniquitates nostras" . . . Take away from us our iniquities.

The "Orate fratres" still points to the fact that the early Roman bishops, like the common people, contributed to the collection by placing bread and wine on the offering table. The priest of today does not contribute to church collections. The idea of bishop and people offering their gifts together has been preserved in the offertory of the cup: "Offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem" . . . We offer unto Thee the cup; "Hanc oblationem quam tibi offerimus" . . . This offering which we offer. However the people's offertory of the bread was removed at Rome in the 9th century, and replaced in the 14th century by a priestly prayer: "Hostiam quam ego offero" . . . The Host (sacrifice) which I offer. Thus the Mass continues with I's and We's, hosts and "things", scrambled together into a mixture of uninterpretable ritualism.

The effects caused by the abolition of the Roman Catechumenate are so many that we have no space here to comment on minor changes. Father Charles Poulet, for example, writes: "When the Catechumenate was discarded as an institution, the practice arose of distributing the Holy Eucharist to infants immediately after Baptism" (*Charles Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, St. Louis, Herder, vol. 1, p. 400*). As babies were unable to swallow the thick matzoths of the 11th century, the West began to teach that the whole Christ is present in one species. Bishop William of Champeaux (d. 1121) explains: "For that reason the cup alone is given to infants just baptized, because they cannot use bread and in the cup they receive the whole Christ" (*Migne, P.L. 163, 1039*). In this condensed chapter on the Mass we will mention only a few of the most important changes and their consequences.

The "Credo" (Nicene Creed) was composed in the fourth

century for the baptismal rites on Whitsunday. In these group Baptisms the plural form "Credimus" was used. In the 11th century the Credo was added to the Mass in order to fill the gap between the sermon and the offertory, formerly filled by the solemn dismissals of the Catechumens. Right after the Credo the priest of today solemnly kisses the altar, turns around to the people and sings in Gregorian monotone: "Oremus" (Let us pray). After returning to the altar he does not pray at all, but reads the story of the antiphon. The reason for the confusion is that the pope who removed the offertory prayers of the people, forgot to remove the invitation to prayer. The offering of the people was known for one thousand years as the "Great Entrance", one of the most impressive ceremonies of the entire service. It was an altar offering wherein the people one by one offered their gift on the altar. With total disregard for tradition Rome abolished it, and changed it in the 12th century into a money offering. Father Fortescue writes: "After the 10th century the offering of the gifts by the people gradually disappeared . . . Our collection of money at the Offertory still represents the old offering" (*The Mass*, p. 300).

The washing of hands after the offertory originated from the fact that the clergy handled the gifts in natura (in modern words: they counted the collection), and set apart the best loaves and wine for the communion services. The early presbyters washed their hands for sanitary reasons, but the ritualistic washing of hands is superfluous as no priest will soil his hands for a living. The word "Offertory" means the place or time for the offering, which word is derived from the irregular Latin verb, "offere" (obtuli, oblatum), from which also the word "oblation" is derived. Therefore the words sacrifice, offering and oblation are perfect synonyms. Those Protestant churches which speak of "collections" instead of "offerings" might as well change the "offertory"

into "collectory".

CONFITEOR

After the Catechumenate had been abolished and the Mass became a service for sinners, the Holy Roman Empire gradually introduced the custom of making a general confession of sin before the Mass. The first confession is found in the minutes of the Council of Chalons (813). It does not read "I confess" (confiteor), but "We confess our sins" (*Mansi 14, 100*). This confession was not made to the priest, but "to one another" (*James 5:16*).

The Irish Confession of the 10th century, falsely attributed to St. Patrick, is still biblical: "I will confess to Thee, my God, because I have sinned in heaven and in earth, as well before Thee and before Thy angels as before the face of all Thy saints [faithful] . . . But I have Thee as the Highpriest to whom I confess all my sins (Sed habeo Te Sacerdotem Summum ad quem confiteor omnia peccata mea). I confess to Thee alone (Tibi soli), my God, because I have sinned against Thee alone, and because Thou alone, O God, art without sin. I beseech Thee . . . by the shedding of Thy blood, that Thou mayest grant to me the remission of all my sins" (*Christian Classics Series*, vol. 6, p. 136).

By the 11th century Southern Europe made the Confiteor part of the Sunday Mass service. Bernold of Constance (d. 1100) is the first to mention it in his famous Micrologue: "Confiteor Deo omnipotenti . . . I confess to Almighty God, to the saints here [in church] and everywhere, and to you, brother, because I have sinned by thought, word, deed, and by pollution of mind and body. Therefore I ask you to pray for me" (*Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus*, Migne, P.L. 151, 992). This Confiteor is still biblical.

By the 14th century Roman Catholics began to confess their sins to the Saints in Heaven. The Western rituals

differed everywhere. The Roman Ritual till the Council of Trent (1545–1563) read: "I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to Blessed Peter and to all the Saints and to you all, brothers, because I have sinned through my fault; I ask you all to pray for me" (*Missal of Pope Paul III, d. 1549*).

In 1570 Pope Pius V abolished all Western Rites and composed the first Roman Catholic Ritual with the following Confiteor: "I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to Blessed Michael the Archangel, to Blessed John the Baptist, to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, FATHER . . ." (*Ritual of Pope Pius V, 1570*). This Confiteor is still used today.

We see, therefore, that rituals constantly change to fit new conditions and traditions. As long as the Bible was the only book used in church, such corruptions did not exist. The ritualistic confession and absolution of the Mass have again lost their significance, because the celebrant of the Mass often announces that he will hear confessions after Mass. The custom of weekly or daily confessions originated in the twentieth century.

LOW MASSES OR PRIVATE MASSES

The Roman Catholic priest of today says Mass every day. The Sunday Mass, if chanted by priest and choir, is called a High Mass. During the week the priest usually recites the Mass in a low voice and employs an altar boy to answer his prayers, which is known as a Low Mass. Both Low and High Masses are of late origin. All Masses of the early Holy Roman Empire (9th cent.) were Sunday Masses, officiated by the bishop. All the local clergy assisted him. There were no private celebrations, nor side-altars.

The Presbyters of the 11th century began to say private Masses. Up to the 13th century (1215) there was great op-

position to daily Masses. In the "concelebration" of the bishop's Mass the clergy used various books for the lengthy liturgy. By the 13th century concelebration died out, so that even bishops began to say private Masses. The prayers of the pontifical Mass were abbreviated and published (hand written) for the first time in one volume. Hence the Missal for the daily Mass originated in the 13th century. Each country still had its own Missal. After the death of Martin Luther, Rome forced her local ritual on the entire West (1570).

In order to reduce the Low Mass to twenty minutes, large portions of the old liturgy were taken out. In editing the new ritual much attention was given not to delete anything familiar to the people, such as familiar portions of chant or parts where the celebrant raises his voice. No attention was paid to whether the abbreviated Missal could be understood. The result was that the new ritual is full of "therefore", "thus", "and also", "in the first place", etc., without any premises left to warrant such logical conclusions ("Et ideo", "Te igitur", "In primis", "Hanc igitur", "Unde et", "Memento etiam", etc.). Some sentences start with a preposition and a relative pronoun, without any antecedent to refer to: "Supra quae . . . On which things", "Per quem haec omnia . . . By whom all these things". Thus the modern ritual has been made unintelligible for priest and laity alike. Even if it were read in English it would make no sense.

Father Adrian Fortescue in his book on "The Mass" and in his articles on the Mass in the Catholic Encyclopedia nearly concurs with every statement I have made. He writes: "Low Mass might lead people to think it is the primitive form. On the contrary, it is a late abridgment . . . Low Mass became necessary when celebrations were so multiplied that every priest said Mass once a day" (*Mass, p. 185*). "The custom of saying each Mass for a definite intention

and the acceptance of a stipend for doing so, naturally helped in the same direction" (*Mass*, p. 187). "This multiplication of Masses led to building many altars in a church . . . It also led to the abridged service we call now Low Mass" (*Mass*, p. 188). "The Missal of Pius V (1570) recognized Low Masses . . . It was Low Mass that caused the compilation of Missals" (*Mass*, p. 189). From the 13th century on it (the Missal) rapidly becomes the only book used" (*Forrescue*, *Mass*, p. 190). The same admission of constant changes can be found in the Catholic Encyclopedia (*C.E.* 5, 581; 9, 797).

SIDE ALTARS

The Cistercian Order of France, founded in 1098, was one of the first to re-introduce the daily celebrations for its monks. These new daily celebrations had nothing in common with those abolished in the ninth century, because they were now celebrated by each monk separately. The Cistercians were the first to build side-altars in their churches to accommodate the new Mass-priests. In the 13th and 14th centuries many cathedrals were rebuilt to make room for the celebration of daily Masses. The Cathedral of Milan refused to introduce side-altars till after the Reformation. The famous Bosuet still protested the custom in the 18th century.

The creation of many altars in one church led to the practice of having several Masses going on at the same time, which, as in a three ring circus, start and finish at different times.

Up to the 13th century (1215) most churches still had only one altar, now called the main altar. Many churches, however, had relic shrines all along the side-aisles. There on decorated tables were displayed some miraculous relic of a saint. The relic, such as a finger, bone, tooth or hair, was usually displayed behind glass in a reliquary or monstrance

(glass show case). When presbyters began to multiply their daily Masses, these show tables had to give way for side-altars, and reliquaries were moved into the sanctuary or placed on top of the main altar.

PRIEST, STANDING BEHIND THE ALTAR, FACED PEOPLE

In the days of concelebration (bishop's Mass) the altar was a plain table without any decoration, such as candles or crucifixes. The "Lord's table" (I Cor. 10:21) was naturally placed on the demarcation line dividing the place of the clergy and of the people, because it was both an offering and communion table. During the 12th and 13th centuries churches began to build backs (*Reredos*) to their altars to provide new space for their relics and statues. The 14th-century Gothic altar became an art gallery of busts and statues of saints and angels reaching the ceiling. For reasons of safety the high altars were moved away from the people and placed against the rear wall of the church. The chairs of the clergy, which used to be behind the altar, were now placed against the side-walls and the celebrant of the Mass was forced to come from behind the altar to its front, with his back turned to the people. "In the ancient basilicas the priest, as he stood at the altar, faced the people" (*C.E.* 1, 346). When the priest today wishes the people to unite with him in prayer (*Oremus*) he must turn around. As the Mass has practically ceased to be a public worship, the rear view of the priest has become accepted as a matter of no importance.

CANDLES AND CRUCIFIXES ON ALTARS

The Dark Ages introduced the light of candles in the Christian church. Their use was not borrowed from the Old Testament, but from the ritual of Mithra. The pagans of

Africa, for example, burned candles in the daylight, they placed burning candles around the body of the deceased and sprinkled it with lustral water to ward off the powers of darkness. Bishop Tertullian (3rd cent.) ridiculed pagan Africa for "exposing useless candles at midday" (*Migne, P.L. 1, 762*). Lactantius (4th cent.) writes: "They burn lights as those dwelling in darkness . . . what superstitions they are enslaved to" (*Migne, P.L. 6, 839*). The Council of Elvira (4th cent.) ruled that no candles may be burned at cemeteries and women may not keep wakes at cemeteries (*Mansi 2, 11*). These very same pagan customs were found among the American Indians, but Rome christianized them. All Souls' Day (Nov. 2) in Catholic Mexico excels the pagan feasts of Africa. The Catholic Encyclopedia admits that "the pagan use of lights at funerals seems to have been taken over by the Church as a harmless piece of ceremonial . . . We need not shrink from admitting that candles, like incense and lustral water, were commonly employed in pagan worship and in the rites paid to the dead. But the Church from a very early period took them into her service . . . to enhance the splendour of religious ceremonial" (*C.E. 3, 246*).

As long as paganism was the State religion of the empire and persecuted the Christians, the national churches were slow to adopt pagan practices. After the persecution had been forgotten and Pope Boniface (610) had 'christianized' the pagan Pantheon, candles began to be introduced in Christian churches (7th cent.). Its first use was given a biblical interpretation. As candles were used in the Old Testament to denote the presence of Jehovah in the Temple, 7th-century Rome thought it not improper to have two acolytes carry two burning candles and have them stand beside the ambo during the reading of the Gospel. God was present through His Word. As beautiful as the thought was, it marks the beginning of the Mithraistic use of candles against which

the Fathers fought so vehemently. It also exposes the fact that the Roman church had no tabernacles.

From the 7th to the 13th century the only candles used by the Roman Church were carried by human hands. There were no permanent fixtures on the altar. By the 11th century the candles were blessed and began to be enumerated among the sacraments. Those who carried the blessed candles needed a special ordination for the office of acolytes. In processions two acolytes flanked the cross carried by a crucifer. There seems to have been a general custom from the 11th to the 13th century not to store the cross and the candlesticks in the sacristy, but to place the cross after the service into a holder standing either in the center of the church, or on top of the altar. The candlesticks of the acolytes were placed "at the horns of the altar", explains Bishop Durandus (d. 1296), and "The cross is placed on the altar, that the cross-bearer may thence raise it" (*Durandus, Rationale; Bk 1, chapt. 3*). This custom either arose to encourage the adoration of the cross by pilgrims and visitors, or to exhibit the relic-studded cross as a piece of art. In any case the cross and candlesticks could only be found on an altar when the altar was not in use.

The abolition of concelebration practically extinguished the office and order of Acolytes and Crucifers, and gradually there arose a custom of placing a crucifix and two burning candles on the altar or side-altar where a presbyter was saying a private Mass. The custom was not adopted by all countries and therefore cannot be called general until Rome abolished all national rites (1570) and prescribed two candles for Low Masses, four candles for private High Masses, six candles for Solemn High Masses, and seven candles for Pontifical High Masses. So the richness of the ritual increases, overshadowing the simple message of the Master.

The 12th-century ritual of Honorius of Autun, when

describing the altar, has nothing to say about altar candles, but it does mention the two candles carried by the Acolytes before the Gospel (*Migne, P.L.* 172, 789). The Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "The custom of placing candlesticks and candles on the altar became general in the sixteenth century" (*C.E.* 1, 350).

The origin of the Easter Candle and of Candlemas processions is pagan also, and will be described in later volumes.

ELEVATION OF THE HOST

"The elevation of the Host at Mass was introduced in the early years of the thirteenth century" (*C.E.* 2, 465). The novelty of elevating a Host for public veneration was first introduced by Bishop Eudes de Sully of Paris in about 1205. It was evidently intended to set the peasants against those French theologians, like Peter Cantor, who still denied the transubstantiation powers of the priest and who protested the sale of Masses. The Low Countries and Great Britain soon adopted the elevation, and in the 14th century the Roman Ritual instructed the Italian priests to elevate the Host. Elevation of the cup came much later.

It also became custom to ring the baptized bells of the church tower to announce the moment of elevation. Just to witness the elevation came to be regarded as having attended Mass. The private Mass introduced the altar bell rung by altar boys. Speaking of the origin of the elevation, Professor Fortescue rightly remarks: "A rite unknown till the 12th century cannot be of first importance in any liturgy" (*Mass, p.* 345). This maxim can be used for all Roman inventions. It was the elevation of the Host during Mass that gradually developed into the extramissal adoration of the Host in Eucharistic processions and Benedictions of the Blessed Sacrament.

LATIN AS A LITURGICAL LANGUAGE

The use of a *dead* language in a *public* worship is a contradiction in thought. Yet the ancient Latin is still the language of the Mass.

Before the fourth century, Rome had neither a Latin Bible, nor a Latin liturgy. After Constantine had moved the capital of the empire to Constantinople, Latin slowly became the official language of Rome. St. Jerome (d. 420) finished his Latin translation of the Bible at the very end of the fourth century. This translation had become necessary because the popes themselves no longer knew the Greek language. The Greek liturgy of Rome, however, continued for some time until it was gradually supplanted by the Latin. By the eighth century Rome had published her first Latin Ritual, falsely attributed to earlier popes.

St. Boniface (d. 755?) and Emperor Charlemagne were not opposed to the use of native languages in the church (*Migne, P.L.* 89, 810), but somehow Latin remained the language of the Mass in Italy, Germany, France and Spain. The Slavic languages were used in the conversion of Bohemia and Poland. After Rome had broken Christian fellowship with the Greek speaking churches (1054), the supporters of Countess Mathilda (St. Anselm of Lucca, St. Peter Damian and Pope Hildebrand) attempted in vain to abolish the ancient Mozarabic Rite of Spain and the Ambrosian Rite of Milan, Italy. They did succeed in establishing the Latin language as the liturgical language of the entire West, some Slavic nations included (*Migne, P.L.* 148, 555). From the 11th to the 16th century the Latin rituals of the West greatly differed until Pope Pius V (1570) forced the West to discard its national rituals and to adopt the local ritual of the city of Rome. "No Eastern Patriarch would tolerate another rite in his patriarchal domain," explains Prof. Fortescue,

hence "in the 16th century the medieval rites were abolished" (*The Mass*, p. 182).

Because of Protestant criticism and resentment among the Catholic laity, the pope in 1953 allowed a few minor changes and exceptions for the Holy Week observance. This gave some of the lower clergy the false impression that Rome was in favor of the vernacular. "Latin is dead," wrote one Catholic magazine, "As a ritual language it should have been allowed to pass away a thousand years ago" (*The Priest*, May, 1956). In 1959 Archbishop O'Brady of St. Paul, Minn., had to warn his priests not to introduce any English services in their churches (*Providence Visitor*, Feb. 26, 1959).

It took Rome 1500 years to abolish the national rites of the West. If Rome were now to allow national languages in her church, it would immediately create such nominal divisions as the German Catholic Church, French Catholic Church, etc., which eventually may lead to schisms. Latin not only serves as an international language, but it hides the obsolete theology of the Mass and the medieval superstitions of the *Rituale Romanum* which still prescribes the liturgical prayers over sick cows, pregnant women, bells, cheese, wine, etc. The priest, who goes through the ritual at 500 words a minute and consequently does not know himself what he is reading, has been told at the seminary that the pronunciation of the words is all that is required. God understands the Latin anyhow. The laity complain about "slow priests". Were the Mass to become a public service in English and to be read at the speed a sermon is preached, it would consume too much time and would need to be condensed once more. The changeable parts of the Mass are so complicated that a priest, using an 'Ordo', has difficulties in selecting the right prayers. As the Mass has become a priestly rite instead of a public worship of the people, the participation

of the laity in the consecration prayers of the Mass is neither needed, nor desired. As languages cannot be translated by just interchanging words with the same number of syllables, the Gregorian Chant would have to differ in various countries. For these and other reasons Rome continues to pray in a dead language, and the Council of Trent in 1562 warned: "If anyone says . . . that the Mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only . . . let him be anathema" (*Mansi* 33, 132). The Bible condemns the Roman Catholic practice of letting an altar boy say "Amen" (may it be so) to a eucharistic prayer of which he has not understood one word (*I Cor.* 14:16; *Matt.* 15:9).

VESTMENTS OF THE MASS

Emperor Charlemagne (d. 814), in his desire to be a 'Roman' emperor, added some Roman vestments to his Teutonic wardrobe. In official capacity as ruler and defender of the faith, he wore a long white alb, girdle, stole and pluviale. State officials and bishops began to wear similar attire. During the Mass the bishops adopted a very strange garment, known as a "chasuble" (casubla), which resembled the Roman dalmatic. The Chasuble, however, was a hooded garment and probably was familiar to those freshly converted from paganism. Italy adopted it, but England protested. The British Penitential, falsely attributed to Egbert, reads: "When a bishop (sacerdos) celebrates Mass he may not wear a hooded cloak (caracallam cassiatam)" (*Migne*, P.L. 89, 404). The Alb, Cincture or Girdle, Stole, Maniple and Chasuble are still the principle vestments of the Mass. They originated during the second half of the 8th century and were officially adopted in the 9th century.

The Alb was still unknown in Rome during the days of St. Jerome (5th cent.), and is first mentioned in the 9th century by Amalarius of Metz (*Migne*, P.L. 105, 1094). It

was worn by all the clergy, by the choir and by those to be baptized. In the 13th century, when concelebration had been abolished and presbyters had become Mass-priests, the long, girded Alb became a Mass vestment. The lower clergy and choir were given a short Alb without girdle, now known as Cotta or Surplice. The modern Alb for the Mass must be several inches too long so that the priest can bind it up with a girdle or Cingulum.

Forerunners of the Stole (stola) are the Prayer-cloth (orarium) and the Super-humeral. The prayer-cloth was worn as early as the sixth century by the one who presided over the prayers. The Super-humeral or shoulder piece is mentioned in the 9th and 11th-century forgery known as the Donation of Constantine. It was originally an imperial garment symbolizing authority. By the 13th century it was worn by the presbyter during Mass, and it became generally known as the Stole (stola).

The early churches had a special prayer room, known as the Secretary or Deacon room, which in the 9th century was turned into a "Sacristy" or Vestry room. By the 13th century, when transubstantiation and daily Masses had been introduced and the touching of sacred vessels by the laity had become unlawful, the office of the Sacristan began to be held by priests. Since 1352 the popes have employed a high ranking clergyman (today a bishop) as papal sacristan, who among other things, must taste the wine and eat two wafers before each papal Mass as a guarantee that the oblations have not been poisoned.

The Maniple (*manipulus*, handkerchief) started out as a 9th-century handkerchief, pinned on the sleeve (for lack of pockets). By the 13th century it was changed into a thick, embroidered Mass garment for daily Masses.

The Chasuble (*casubla*, little house) was worn in the 9th century by bishops only. In the 13th century it became a

Mass vestment for presbyters.

The Cope was introduced in the 12th century for Cantors (singers) and became a priestly garment for Eucharistic processions in the 15th century. The shield which dangles from the back of the cope used to be a hood, because the cope used to be a rain coat (*pluviale*).

The bishop's miter dates from the 11th century, and the bishop's cross from the 17th century. The so-called Roman Collar, buttoned in the back, is of Protestant (Anglican) origin and dates from the middle of the 19th century.

Up to the 13th century the church vestments were white and of modest design. After the introduction of daily Low Masses other colors were added: white for feastdays of Christ and Mary; red for Apostles and Martyrs; purple for Lent; black for funerals; and green for other occasions (*Roman Ordo XIV, canon 49; Migne, P.L. 78, 1154*).

There is a movement today to encourage Protestant ministers to return to their medieval church vestments ("High Church movement") in order to facilitate merger with Anglican, Orthodox and Roman Catholic bodies. The Mass vestments may have some psychological effect on people, but they remain pagan in origin. They do not contribute to the salvation of souls, but rather detract.

ERRORS OF THE MISSAL

We have already mentioned many errors and inconsistencies in the text of the Mass, some caused by major changes in theology, others by the process of condensing the text of the private Mass. Before we conclude our brief treatise on the liturgy of the Mass, we must mention a few more peculiarities of the ritual.

Because of the antiquity of the Gregorian Chant (7th cent.) certain parts of the ancient Bishop's Mass which were chanted have been preserved, though the text no

longer fits modern practices. For example, the reading of the Gospel is said to be "in sequence" (in sequentia). In the early church every sermon was a homily on the Bible. Only that portion of the Gospel was read on which the bishop was going to preach. The following Sunday the bishop continued where he had left off. Hence all reading of the Scriptures was in sequence. The modern ritual does not believe in sequences; it may jump from the first chapter of John to the last chapter of Matthew; yet the celebrant sings of "The sequence of the Holy Gospel". Thus it has become a ritual of words without meaning. A similar case is the "Ite missa est", a pre-Christian Mithraistic form of dismissal, meaning: Go home, this is the dismissal. The Gregorian chant of the word "Ite" alone has 26 notes. The priest sings it at the top of his voice, yet it is all for nothing. The people are no longer allowed to go home at this point. This used to be the end of the Mass, but not anymore. Post-Reformation popes have added several prayers to the Mass, like the Benediction, the Last Gospel, and the prayer for the king. Pope Leo XIII in 1884 added Three Hail Marys, the Salve Regina and the prayer to St. Michael. A triple salutation to the Sacred Heart was added later. All these additions take another ten minutes before the people are allowed to rise and to leave their pews. Hence the *Ite Missa est* is not only of pagan origin, but has become meaningless ritualism.

The second list of saints, found in the "Memento etiam" prayers, starts out with "John". In the 19th century the theologians argued whether this John was the Baptist or the Apostle until Rome forbade all disputes on this matter. Hence the priest is ritually forced to pray to a certain "John", but he is not allowed to know to whom he is praying.

The sixth-century rite of Milan adopted the four mysterious epithets of "Adscriptam, Ratam, Rationabilem, Acceptabilemque" which were evidently borrowed from the secret

rites of initiation of the soldiers of Mithra (*Migne, P.L. 16, 462; see also Migne, P.L. 2, 66*). Only the last epithet, "Acceptable" could refer to a sacrifice, the other three refer to people. They may be translated as "enlisted", said only of soldiers (*I Maccabees 10:36*); "fixed" or ratified; "reasonable" and "acceptable". These magic words were once the main form of consecration, and, according to some, they were what the Middle Ages referred to as the "perilous prayer". If the priest stumbled over these words he had to do penance (*Migne, P.L. 105, 702*). Having before him one tiny round host, the modern priest tries to transubstantiate it by making five benedictions (crosses) over it. How a host could possibly become "enlisted" at the command of a priest, or could become "ratified" and "reasonable", no theologian has ever been able to explain. Prof. Fortescue has no explanation (*The Mass, p. 334*). Rome tried to hide the pagan magic words by putting the adjective "Benedictam" (blessed) in front of them. The French Church tried to change "ratam" into "gratam". Hildebert of Tours (11th cent.) tried to change the meaning of *adscriptam* to "conscriptam" (*Migne, P.L. 171, 1164*). Florus, the Deacon of Tours (837) is the first theologian to mention these magic words in his "Exposition of the Mass". He writes: "These words of mystery are so profound, so miraculous and stupendous; who can comprehend them? . . . They should be rather worshipped and feared than discussed" (*Migne, P.L. 119, 58*). In other words, Florus admits that he does not know the meaning of these words, yet he demands greater respect for them than for the Word of God. Presbyter Amalarius of Metz (9th cent.) mentions the magic words, but has no explanation (*Migne, P.L. 105, 1153*). Neither has the Micrologue of Bernold of Constance (d. 1100) an explanation (*Migne, P.L. 151, 987*); nor has Abbot Rupert of Heribert (d. 1135) (*Migne, P.L. 170, 39*); nor has the great Bishop

Durandus (*Rationale*, bk 4). Theologians like Honorius of Autun (12th cent.) avoid the problem altogether (*Migne*, P.L. 172, 793). This author reveals that by the 12th century a total of 72 crosses or benedictions were made over the bread and wine to effect a conversion (*Migne*, P.L. 172, 791). The Daily Missal by Father Gaspar Lefebvre (*St. Paul, Minn.*, 1927) is not ashamed to translate the magic words as: "to bless, approve, ratify, make worthy and acceptable" (p. 62). Another English translation reads: "to bless, consecrate, approve, make reasonable and acceptable." Of course, by false translations one can change the meaning and teachings of the ritual as well as of the Bible.

INCENSING OF THE ALTAR

Northern Europe was acquainted with incense before it had heard of Christianity. In Germany incense is called "Weihrauch" (holy smoke; compare: weihwasser, holy water; weihnacht, holy night). By the 11th century the entire West used the burning of incense at the time of the reading of the Gospel. This was the only use of incense until the 13th century. Twelfth-century liturgists like Abbot Rupert (*Migne*, P.L. 170, 27), Bishop Hildebert (*Migne*, P.L. 171, 1159), and Honorius of Autun (*Migne*, P.L. 172, 789) are still unacquainted with the incensing of the altar.

After the invention of transubstantiation and the elevation of the Host, France introduced the incensing of the altar, and the 14th-century Ritual of Rome adopted the French novelty. Bishop John Burchard, who composed the present Roman Missal about the year 1500, tried to make the burning of incense more biblical by adding to the ritual: "Through the intercession of Blessed Michael, the Archangel, standing at the right of the altar of incense" (Compare Luke 1:11). However, the Bible says that the angel at the altar of incense was Gabriel, not Michael (Luke 1:19). John Burchard, who

made the blunder, was apparently tired out from watching the sex orgies of Pope Alexander (see my book: *Catholic Victory*, p. 103). There it stands: Michael. Fifty-four thousand priests in the United States repeat that blunder every day. All Roman Catholic priests, the popes included, have repeated this error for 400 years. No one is allowed to change it, because the Council of Trent decreed: "If anyone says that the Canon of the Mass contains errors . . . let him be anathema" (*Mansi* 33, 131). In 1570 Pope Pius V by papal decree ("Quo primum", which is still attached to the latest missals) ordained "that nothing at any time may be added, subtracted or revised . . . For if anyone shall presume to attempt to do so, let it be known to him that the wrath of God Almighty shall be upon him."

This is the Mass which 12th-century France began to sell to its peasants: a ritual of incoherent phrases, full of errors and obsolete theologies.

MASS STIPENDS

WHAT IS A MASS STIPEND AND WHEN WAS THE SALE OF MASSES FIRST INTRODUCED?

France introduced the sale of Masses in the 12th century and Thomas Aquinas justified it in the 13th century. The new custom is related to the doctrine of transubstantiation, the real sacrificial character of the Mass, Mass intentions, Low Masses and numerous other doctrines and customs which arose in the 11th and 12th centuries. The fact that France in the days of Honorius of Autun (12th cent.) abolished its offerings *in natura*, i.e., perishable collections, and introduced the money-offerings, might also have contributed to the new custom of charging one silver piece (denarius) for each Mass.

Mass stipends could not have originated as early as the 7th or 8th centuries for multiple reasons. How could France have sold a real sacrifice in the 9th century when her leading theologian, Ratramus, explained to the German Emperor that the French view of the Eucharist was symbolic (*Migne, P.L. 121, 125*)?

Roman Catholic authors explain: "By a Mass-stipend is meant a certain monetary offering which anyone makes to the priest with the accompanying obligation of celebrating Mass in accordance with the intentions of the donor" (*C.E. 10, 21*). "The practice of giving the priest a money alms for the Mass dates from the seventh or eighth century, and became a universal practice in the twelfth" (*Father Conway, Question Box, p. 271*).

Roman theologians, who are forever engaged in the battle of semantics, try to justify their unchristian practices by creating artificial distinctions which are not based on the Scriptures, nor on tradition, nor on reason. Manuals of Roman Catholic theology have become catalogues of distinctions. Every chapter starts out with: "Distinguere debemus, we must distinguish." These predetermined distinctions, though artificially designed to aid their argumentation, are presented without a shred of evidence, as self-evident truths or as generally accepted premises. Thus they have created distinctions between veneration and adoration, annulment and divorce, etc. In regard to the method of obtaining the benefits of a Mass, Roman Catholic people are instructed to use the word "alms" instead of "price", the word "stipend" instead of "cost", the expression "ordering a Mass" instead of "buying a Mass" or "sale of Masses". Yet these same people are informed that their various kind of Masses have "fixed" stipends, to be paid in advance. At least, Rome admits that there is a monetary transaction or contract which obligates the priest to fulfill his part of the bargain. Rome further admits that the origin of Mass stipends is not biblical, but medieval.

Prof. D. Prummer of the Catholic University of Freiburg in his textbook on Moral Theology defines the Mass stipend as follows: "A Mass stipend is not in the least given as a payment (pretium) for the sacrifice — for this would con-

stitute a shameful sin of simony — but it is given as an alms for the proper support of the priest" (*Prummer, Vademecum, Freiburg, 1923, p. 338*). In the first place this fine distinction is deceptive, for it does not explain that the priest receives a salary for his services and that he receives free board and room, including groceries, furniture and fuel. Secondly, every practical aspect of the stipend contradicts its definition. By quoting canon laws 824 to 840, Dr. Prummer explains that even a rich priest may demand a stipend; that the stipend constitutes a contract between two parties; that a priest who neglects to say the "promised" Mass commits a grave sin of theft and is bound to restitution; that "the amount of a stipend for Masses is established by diocesan statute"; that every stipend has a minimum, but not a maximum; that the priest may demand more than the minimum amount whenever there are special stipulations as to time and place; that the amount of the stipend for "founded Masses" (paid from the interest of a grant, fund or estate) is determined by the diocesan bishops; etc., etc.

Father Conway admits that the practice of Mass stipends did not become general till the 12th century. Anyone can understand that the church could not have approved payments or fees for the distribution of Sacraments as early as the 7th century, for it would not have taken 500 years for such a profitable custom to become general. The confusion lies in the fact that some unscrupulous French bishops of the 7th century began to charge money for Communion services. As we have mentioned before, the altar bread was called "the sacrifice" and was given into the hand of the communicant. An Irish Penitential of the 7th century ruled: "If one loses the altar bread (sacrificium), he shall do penance for a year" (*Migne, P.L. 80, 227*). A Roman Penitential of the 9th century decreed: "He who vomits the altar bread (sacrificium), because of an overloaded stomach, shall do

penance for 40 days" (*Migne, P.L. 105, 701*). The 7th-century sale of "sacrifices" was not only illegal, but has no relation to the 12th-century sale of Masses.

St. Peter was the first to condemn the practice of exchanging spiritual gifts for material gifts (*Acts 8:20*), and since that time the acceptance of stipends has been known as the sin or heresy of Simon Magnus, or as simony. "Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold . . . but by the precious blood of Christ" (*I Peter 1:18-19*). "Ye Elders . . . Feed the flock of God . . . not for filthy lucre's sake, but voluntarily" (*I Peter 5:2*).

St. Cyprian (d. 258), Bishop of Carthage, warned in his Catechism that "the grace of God must be without a price" (*Migne, P.L. 4, 806*). The early Irish Church quoted the proverbs of St. Patrick (d. 461) that "it is not permitted for church officials to accept money, 'because money blinds the eyes of the wise and changes the words of the just' (*Deut. 16:19*)" (*Migne, P.L. 53, 827*).

In the beginning of the 7th century the barbarian bishops of Gaul began to accept money for Communion services, and invented the modern excuse that the communicant did not actually pay for services rendered, but merely made a free contribution. Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) immediately condemned the practice and wrote to France: "That we should not try to get anything with sin, under the pretense of almsgiving, we are plainly warned by Holy Scripture which says: 'The sacrifices of the wicked are abominable which are offered out of wickedness' (*Prov. 21:27*) . . . Hence we can easily understand how much God is grieved when a sacrifice is brought for the love of loot (*sacrificium ex rapina*). Exceedingly to be shunned, then, most beloved brethren, is the perpetration of the sins of simoniacal heresy under the pretense of almsgiving" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 1030*). When the Frankish bishops continued to sell all the exist-

ing church rites (Baptism and Communion, weddings and funerals, profession of nuns and ordination of clerics), Gregory wrote to the Queen of the Franks: "For who will any more venerate what is sold, or does not think worthless what is bought . . . It must be interdicted strictly under penalty of anathema" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 1038*). "Furthermore for Ordinations, or for the marriages of clerics, or from virgins who are veiled, let no one presume to receive a stipend" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 699*).

The 7th-century Ecumenical Councils (in Trullo, 692) forbade the clergy to accept stipends for the sacraments: "That no one, whether Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon, when giving the immaculate Communion, shall exact from him who communicates stipends of any kind. For grace is not to be sold, nor do we give the sanctification of the Holy Spirit for money (nec pro pecuniis Spiritus sanctificationem impartimur) . . . But if any of those enrolled among the clergy make demands on those he communicates, let him be deposed as an imitator of the error and wickedness of Simon" (*Mansi 11, 954*).

Emperor Charlemagne (d. 814) decreed for his Western Empire: "That no Presbyter may exact any price for the administration of Baptism and Communion, no minimum nor maximum, because we have freely received and we must freely administer; because they must not sell the gift and grace of God, which is given gratuitously" (*Mansi 13, 1082*). The two Sacraments here mentioned refer to those administered privately to adults in danger of death.

There are no canon laws, promulgated during the first thousand years of Christianity, which approve of stipends. My reader may also have noted that the early canons of the church condemn the sale of "Communion" but do not mention the "Mass", because it did not exist. Roman theologians of today maintain that the practice of stipends

existed as early as the 7th century, because the church would not condemn the practice unless it existed. They further admit that it was not till the 12th century that the church "tacitly" approved the custom.

Pope Leo IV (d. 833), who abolished the catechumenate, the daily celebrations and introduced the Sunday Mass with its "Asperges", also warned against accepting stipends for the sacraments (*Migne, P.L. 115, 677*). St. Ulrich (d. 973), Bishop of Augsburg and the first saint to be canonized by the bishop of Rome, condemned stipends (*Migne, P.L. 135, 1072*).

There were no Mass stipends before the 12th century, and when they were invented they were as vigorously attacked as the sale of Baptisms and Communions. Hugo of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, Peter Cantor, Peter of Blois, Gilbert of Gemblours and any other theologian of name condemned the idea of Mass stipends.

Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1147) established the custom among Roman Catholic theologians to dedicate an entire chapter "On Simony" when writing "On the Sacraments" (*Migne, P.L. 176, 478*). Peter Cantor (d. 1197), a personal friend of Pope Celestine, says that simony itself has invaded the sacred sanctuary of the altar and that the French priests are worse than Judas, because, while it is true that Judas sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver and the priests demand only one piece of silver, Judas somehow repented and threw the money away, but the priests keep it (*Migne, P.L. 205, 99*). Peter Cantor was whisked away to a monastery where he suddenly died at the close of the 12th century. This murder marks the beginning of the "tacit approval" of Mass stipends by the church.

The early church had frowned on the use of silver and gold in the services of the church. When the 12th century introduced money offerings during the Mass and when

13th-century Rome began to levy a ten per cent church tax on all Christians (*Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, canon 54; Mansi 22, 1042*) which were collected by papal tax collectors in such brutal manner that the walled cities of the Holy Roman empire shut their gates for the cardinals (*Baronius, Annales, vol. 19, p. 122*); when the French Council of Lyons (1274) adopted the seven sacraments and poisoned its greatest scholars, like St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure; when the new Sacrament of Extreme Unction was made "accessible only to the rich" (*C.E. 5, 717*); when St. Catherine of Siena (d. 1380) called the Roman hierarchy "Demons of Hell" and "Venders of divine grace" (*Caterina, Epistole, vol. 1, p. 253*); when the popes themselves sold indulgences everywhere, it is no wonder that the Mass stipend became "a universal practice" in the 12th and 13th centuries.

Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) is the first Italian theologian to approve the Mass stipend under the pretext that the offering was for the support of the priest and not the price of the Mass (*Summa II, Qu. 100, Art. 2*). "The character of a pure alms," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, "has been since lost by the stipend, since such may be accepted by even a wealthy priest" (*C.E. 10, 21*). John Wycliff (d. 1384) denounced the sale of Masses and the methods of church taxes (*Mansi 27, 633*). His British followers, the Lollards, condemned all piety for money and taught that "All are simoniacs who offer themselves to pray for others, who in turn must provide for their temporal needs" (*Mansi, 27, 633*). The same Council of Constance (1415) which excommunicated John Wycliff and burned John Hus, admitted that "Pope John XXIII sold for cash money: indulgences for the dying, the preaching of the cross, and also absolution from punishment and from guilt; concessions of church altars and portable altars, consecrations of bishops,

ordinations of Abbots, relics of the saints, Sacred Orders, the power to absolve from sins in confessions, and other acts which only through the working of the Holy Spirit must be administered gratuitously" (*Mansi 27, 666*).

Martin Luther (d. 1546) protested: "This abuse has brought an endless flood of other abuses, until faith in the sacrament has been utterly extinguished and the divine sacrament has been turned into an article of trade, the subject of bargaining and business deals. Hence arise fellowships, fraternities, intercessions, merits, anniversaries, memorials; and such like pieces of business are bought and sold, and contracts and bargains are made about them. The entire maintenance of priests and monks now depends on these things."

That the 12th and 13-century sale of Masses was something new and was motivated by greed is further demonstrated by the fact that presbyters began to say as many as seven Masses a day. The Council of Tarragona (1239; canon 6) limited the priest to one Mass a day (*Mansi 23, 514*). Similar legislation was passed by Rome and falsely attributed to the 11th century (*Migne, P.L. 146, 1410; Mansi 19, 979*). By the end of the 13th century all Western priests were limited to one Mass a day.

Bishop John Burchard (d. 1506), who wrote the rubrics for the modern Mass, tried to make the sale of Masses look less mercenary by prescribing a little ceremony during the Mass which resembled somewhat the offering in natura of the early church (see *C.E. 4, 105*). After the protests of the Reformers the sale of indulgences diminished but the sale of Masses increased. In the 17th century, we not only find bequests for perpetual Memorial Masses, but the French clergy began to sell the newly invented Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament (*C.E. 2, 466*). When pecuniary penances had been abolished and voluntary offerings of the confession

box were falling off, the priests began to impose Mass stipends for the forgiveness of sin. This was practised till the Councils of Cologne (1860) and Utrecht (1865) abolished it (*Mansi* 48, 141).

Since the 15th-century dogma of the existence of a Purgatory (Council of Florence, 1439) and the invention that indulgences can be applied to the souls in Purgatory (Pope Sixtus IV, 1476), most Masses began to be said for the dead. During Mass Christ is believed to die especially for the benefit of the donor or for the intention of the donor (purchaser). To make sure that one does not have to burn for hundreds of years in the flames of Purgatory, the Catholic is advised to make arrangements for hundreds of Masses while he is still alive, otherwise he will have to depend on whatever number of Masses his relatives may order for him after his death. By donating a farm to the church or by bequeathing a large fund in one's will, one can insure oneself against the fires of Purgatory. "Mass-foundations (*Fundationes missarum*)," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, "are fixed bequests of funds or real property, the interest or income from which is to procure for ever the celebration of Mass for the founder or according to his intentions" (*C.E.* 10, 21). If one's bank account is well known to the priest, one does not have to go to the rectory for Masses, but can order them by phone. By ordering one hundred Masses over the phone and promising the priest a fat check in the mail, one will be assured that Christ will die for him and his intention one hundred times. Some monks offer special prices for ordering them in big quantities. The following advertisements are not uncommon: "Are you insured? Write and ask about our plan to offer Gregorian Masses after your death. This is real insurance for your soul" (*Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind., Aug. 11, 1946*). "Enroll yourself or loved ones in the Sacred Heart Mass

League . . . Mass said daily to the end of time . . . Write to Father Superior, Sacred Heart Mission House, Sainte Marie, Illinois" (*The Register, Denver, Colo., Oct. 3, 1948*). Thus the sale of Masses has developed into some sort of fire insurance which makes a lie of the biblical teaching: "You have been saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast" (*Eph.* 2:8-9).

Rome more than tacitly approves the sale of Masses, because this subject is well covered by canon law (canon 824) and by the statutes of local dioceses. Rome claims that her bishops and priests have "the right" to exact stole fees for Baptisms, Confirmations, Masses, Ordinations, Weddings, Funerals, Extreme Unctions, Consecration of churches, etc., etc. Today, fees are still collected for all sacraments, except for the Sacrament of Penance (the Redemptions of the Middle Ages have been abolished).

While Rome vigorously denies that Masses are sold, she instructs her people how much they must pay for the Mass. For example, the "Catholic Layman's Book of Etiquette", by Robert Broderick (*St. Paul, Minn., 1956*) is for sale in Catholic churches and tells the people how much they should pay for Masses (*p.* 110), for Baptisms (*p.* 78), weddings (*p.* 128), Extreme Unction (*p.* 156), etc. In this 320 page book the word Bible is never mentioned, but it constantly warns the people that, if they do not know the fixed amount of the fee, they must first inquire. This book further explains that the number of Masses said for a person depends on the amount of money given: "It is not proper for a lay person to request more Masses than the amount of the fund provides for under the customary fees established" (*p.* 110). Every stipend has a minimum, regulated by diocesan statute or by unwritten custom. There is no maximum for a stipend. Where the minimum stipend for a Low Mass

is set at two dollars, a priest is not under obligation to say 50 Masses if a lay person offers him one hundred dollars without specifying how many Masses he wants for them.

During the depression and drought years the Council of Omaha, Neb., in 1934 regulated the prices of Masses for the sand hills of Nebraska as follows: minimum fee for an announced Low Mass . . . \$2.00; for High Mass . . . \$15.00; for Solemn Mass . . . \$30.00; etc. (*Omaha Statutes of 1934, Article 182*). As the Mass has a fixed minimum fee, as it must be paid in advance, as the rich can order hundreds of Masses because they can write bigger checks than the poor, as Masses are advertised in papers and magazines, it is correct to say that the Mass is "sold".

In the United States alone 54,000 Masses are said daily for an average of one hundred thousand dollars a day, or one million dollars every ten days. The Mass stipend, though tax exempt, does not go to the church but becomes the property of the priest.

CHAPTER FOUR

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND ITS TRAIN OF INVENTIONS

WHAT IS THE DATE OF ORIGIN OF AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRANSUBSTANTIATION, BLOOD MIRACLES, WITHHOLDING OF THE CUP, ADORATION OF THE HOST, EUCHARISTIC PROCESSIONS, CORPUS CHRISTI, MONSTRANCE, BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, TANTUM ERGO, TABERNACLES, FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION, INCENSE, ALTAR LAMPS, AND GENUFLECTIONS IN CHURCHES?

In the modern editions of the 11-century writings of Peter Damian and Hildebert of Tours we now find the strange technical term of "transubstantiation" (*Migne, P.L. 145, 880; 171, 1153*), but there is no evidence that the doctrine implied by the term was then known or widely accepted. One hundred years after Peter Damian we find the term ignored by Peter Lombard (d. 1164?) who is considered the greatest scholar of the 12th century. Peter Lombard speaks only of a "conversion", i.e., a change in the bread and wine, and comments: "But if one asks what

kind of conversion there is: whether it is formal, or substantial, or of another kind, I am not able to define" (*Migne, P.L.* 192, 861). This much is clear, that in the middle of the 12th century (1150) transubstantiation was not a Roman Catholic dogma and that Archbishop Lombard refused to expound this doctrine. Yet Lombard's *Summa* was the popular textbook of the 13th century, used and expounded by such immortal Saints as Raymond of Penafort, Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. There is also the wrong conception that Pope Innocent III and his Fourth Lateran Council (1215) made transubstantiation a dogma of faith. In his own theological works Pope Innocent III merely tries to unite the two different schools of thought within his own fold. He writes: "The *real* body is eaten *sacramentally*, that is, under the element; the *mystical* body, however, is eaten *spiritually*, that is, in faith under the element of the bread, in faith of the heart" (*Migne, P.L.* 217, 866). The text of the Fourth Lateran Council does not employ the word "transubstantiation", but uses the verb "transubstantiated". The clause has all the marks of being an explanatory, parenthetical interpolation: "the bread being transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood by the power of God" (*Mansi* 22, 982). If this clause is genuine it follows that this allegedly infallible council erred twice in one little clause, because it denies the presence of blood in the transubstantiated Host and it denies the transubstantiation powers of the priest, both of which are now dogmas of faith.

Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) is the first theologian to disown all older views about the Lord's Table, including consubstantiation. "It has been held that the substance of bread and wine remain in the sacrament," writes Thomas, but this view too "is to be avoided as heretical" (*Summa III*,

Q 72, Art. 2). Thomas, however, was not as famous in the 13th century as he is today. Bishop Durandus (d. 1296), as celebrated as Thomas and belonging to the same order, still held that "Christ could be present in the Eucharist with the substance of bread and wine remaining" (*C.E.* 5, 208).

John Wycliff (d. 1384) of the University of Oxford taught: "The material substance of bread and the material substance of wine remain . . . It is not set forth in the Gospel that Christ instituted the Mass" (*Mansi* 27, 632). As the Council of Constance (1415) condemned Wycliff, it indirectly made the opposite teaching of true faith. In 1551 the Council of Trent defined the dogma formally and finally, but used the word "conversion" in order to make the doctrine a few years older: "And this conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church conveniently and properly called transubstantiation" (*Mansi* 33, 82).

The theological term "transubstantiation" and even the overworked philosophical adverb "substantially" are as scientific as the 17th-century condemnation of Galileo by the popes, or the 19th-century practice of "blood-letting" by physicians. The late Middle Ages borrowed the term "substance" from Aristotle (4th cent. B.C.). The *substance* of a thing, according to prehistoric scientists, lies hidden underneath the *accidents* like a kernel in a shell. During Mass the priest changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, but the accidents (shape, color, smell, taste) remain. This explanation satisfied the peasants of the Middle Ages, but hardly convinces a modern chemist. It would be a pity if the average chemist in a crime laboratory could not distinguish a wine spot from a blood spot, except by its shape, color, smell or taste. Blood is made up of protoplasmic cells not found in wine, while wine has an alcoholic content not

found in ordinary blood. Hence the science of chemistry has reduced transubstantiation to the rank of other myths of the Middle Ages.

The modern doctrine of transubstantiation is not to be regarded as an extreme form of the doctrine of the "Real Presence". Transubstantiation denotes no presence at all. There can be no presence unless there are at least two entities: A is in B; Peter is in church; Christ is in the bread. When one changes a church into Peter, or one changes the bread into Christ, one can only speak of a transformation, but no longer of a presence. Transubstantiation not only implies that the substance of the bread has mysteriously disappeared, but it also implies that the change can be effected long before Communion and even without Communion, in spite of the biblical "take and eat". This is what Catholic theologians wrongly refer to as the "Permanent Presence". Once the priest has consecrated the Host during Mass, he has a Host-god before him, long before the time of Communion. The priest can elevate this Host-god for adoration; he can take the Host-god for a walk through the aisles of the church or through the corn fields and he can lock Him up in a safe, known as the Tabernacle, and preserve Him for later use. Thus the late doctrine of transubstantiation created a host of new inventions.

It is true that the early church showed a great reverence towards the mystery of the Lord's Table, but it is equally true that it used ordinary bread, baked by housewives, which was blessed by a common prayer of thanksgiving. St. Justin Martyr (2nd cent.) and St. Cyprian (3rd cent.) relate that some of the bread was taken home for those who were unable to attend the services (*Migne, P.G.* 6, 427; *P.L.* 4, 501), while the Council of Laodicea (4th cent.) tried to abolish the common practice by bishops of mailing the altar bread at Easter to their fellow-bishops as a eulogia

of communion and fellowship. These early practices are far removed from the modern conception of a *cultus latræ* (a worship due to God alone) as defined by the Council of Trent in 1551 (*Mansi* 33, 85).

CORPUS CHRISTI

The adoration of the Host was introduced by France in the 13th century and the Feast of Corpus Christi (Body of Christ) was instituted by Pope Urban IV in 1264 (*Bull "Transiturus"*; *Mirbt*, No. 364). Host-worship was introduced during the life time of St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) and is based on the new doctrine of "the permanence of the real presence" (*C.E.* 5, 581).

France claims that the first instance of Host-worship occurred in 1226, when Bishop Pierre de Corbie ordered the public adoration of the Host-god in celebration of the extermination of the heretical Albigenses by the armies of King Louis VII. The Augustinian Order of Belgium claims that Host-worship was instituted as early as 1208 when so requested by one of their nuns, Juliana. Blessed Juliana (d. 1259) is called the Apostle of Host-worship, but Rome has never seen fit to canonize her a saint. In any case, Host-worship originated in Liege, Belgium, in 1208; or in France in 1226; and the Western novelty was adopted by Rome in 1264. As it was introduced after the final Schism (1054) it is unknown in the East.

The elevation of the Host during Mass (13th cent.) is the forerunner of all Host-worship (*C.E.* 2, 465-466; *Forstescue, The Mass*, p. 342). It would seem inconsistent for Rome to approve the feast of Corpus Christi before she introduced the Elevation of the Host. As Pope Urban IV himself came from Liege and knew Juliana, his Bull of Sept. 8, 1264 is probably genuine, but thirteen popes who succeeded him totally ignored the Feast until Pope Clement

V in 1314 was persuaded to confirm the older Bull and to promote the feast in Italy. It is almost certain that the liturgy and hymns of Corpus Christi originated in the 14th century.

EUCCHARISTIC PROCESSIONS

The Catholic Encyclopedia claims that Eucharistic processions were introduced in the 13th century, after the year 1264 (*C.E.* 2, 466). If one refers to liturgical processions wherein the priest carries the Host in a monstrance or other vessel, preceded by light carriers and thurifers, one must assign them to the 14th century. Whether 13th or 14th century, the *circumgestations* or *Theophoric* (god-carrying) processions are of extremely late origin considering the great importance now attached to them.

The French invention of "permanent presence" led to Host-worship at occasions other than the Mass. The Host-god was taken through the city streets and through the corn fields so He may personally bless the people and their crops. These extra-missal activities led to the creation of lamps, thuribles, monstrances and baldachins (canopies), most of them borrowed from the Mohammedans. They also led to the creation of new hymns to be sung during these processions.

THURIBLES

France had introduced incense to symbolize the presence of God during the reading of the Gospel. After the introduction of Host-worship, burning coals were placed in a silver or golden vessel and incense was offered to the Host-god by pouring it over the coals. The invention of processions led to the invention of Censers or Thuribles, i.e. incense vessels suspended by chains and swung by hand. The invention of thuribles led again to the novelty of incensing

the altar and the clergy, while the incensing of the altar led again to the blunder of the new missal which says that "Michael" is standing by the altar of incense.

BLOOD MIRACLES

The doctrine of transubstantiation created the "fear" of spilling the blood out of the cup, a fear never expressed by any of the Fathers of the Church. The invention of Host-worship (the Cup was never worshipped) also aided in diminishing the importance of the cup. Both transubstantiation and adoration of the Host led to a new doctrine, still denied by Pope Innocent III (1215), namely, that the cup is of little importance, because the Host already contains the blood of Christ. The controversies about the cup lasted 200 years as we shall see in the following article.

The opponents of the cup, unable to defend their cupless Host-worship either by Scripture or tradition, began to resort to miracles to prove their point and swing the people over to their side. The very first of all 'Bleeding Hosts' miracles is that of Paris in 1290, which has drawn millions of tourists to the Church of St. Francis in Paris. "Miracle des Billettes in 1290, when blood flowed from a Host which had been profaned by a Jew" (*C.E.* 11, 488). "In 1290 a Parisian Jew committed a series of outrages upon a Host and he was put to death" (*C.E.* 7, 493). The French Host miracle was copied by the anti-Calixtines of all countries. "The Collegiate Church of Sainte-Gudule at Brussels preserves miraculous hosts which, after the perpetration of many outrages by the Jews in 1370, were collected" (*C.E.* 7, 493). There is hardly a country in Catholic Europe which does not exhibit some blood miracle. "Accounts of miracles multiplied in a way to convince even the most obstinate" (*C.E.* 7, 492).

Jew-baiting was quite popular in the 13th and 14th

centuries, because Pope Innocent III (1215) had demanded the total extermination of all heretics (Albigenses and Waldenses) and the segregation of all Jews. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had ruled that no Jew may run for public office and that all Jews must wear a special garb (*Mansi* 22, 1055). One naturally wonders why the Jews behaved so well towards 'hosts' during the first thousand years and why they became so infuriated in the 13th and 14th centuries just at the time when the Franciscans wanted to prove that there is blood in a consecrated host. One may wonder whose blood is actually exhibited in all these churches. One may also wonder why so many miracles occurred after the doctrine of transubstantiation had been accepted, and why none occurred before the doctrine was known.

WITHHOLDING OF THE CUP

The Western Catholics received Communion under the elements of both bread and wine till the 15th century when the Council of Constance (1415), in absence of any reigning pope, decreed that the wine should not be given to the laity. The same popeless council condemned John Hus of Bohemia to death for expounding the biblical verse of Matt. 26:27 ("Ye all") in support of the 1400 year old tradition of giving the cup to the laity. The Council of Trent in 1562 officially condemned the practice of giving the laity wine in Communion (*Mansi* 33, 123). The Reformers, like the Eastern churches, did not withhold the cup from the laity. The Roman Catholics of the Eastern Rites (Uniate) also receive the wine till this day.

There was a movement in the early church of serving water instead of wine, because of the alcoholic content of the wine. St. Cyprian (d. 258) condemned the movement and prescribed that the wine should be diluted with water.

He warned his church that there is no representation of the blood of Christ when the wine is absent (*Migne, P.L.* 4, 386). Pope Leo the Great (d. 461; *Migne, P.L.* 54, 280) and the Roman Council of 496 under Pope Gelasius the Great (*Mansi* 8, 146), forbade the withholding of the cup: "They should either receive the whole sacrament or they should abstain altogether, because one cannot divide this one and the same mystery without committing a great sacrilege" (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 149).

In the 9th-century Holy Roman Empire some extremists of the Real Presence theory began to distribute blessed bread with unblessed wine ("cum vino non consecrato"). Leading theologians of the era, like Amalarius of Metz, immediately condemned the new invention (*Migne, P.L.* 105, 1032).

After the Schism (1054) the Roman Catholic Church continued to serve the bread and wine separately. The Council of Clermont (1095) decreed: "That no one shall communicate from the altar, unless he separately consumes the body and likewise the blood (unless by necessity and for caution)" (*Mansi* 20, 818). If the parenthetical clause is not an interpolation, it probably refers to Communion other than "from the altar", such as the Viaticum of the sick and the cup given to baptized babies.

By the 12th century some conversionists began to fear the spilling of the true blood and invented the "Dipping" method. Some bishops began to dip the particle of the consecrated wafer into the consecrated wine. Technically the Cup (the vessel) was withheld, but not the Blood of Christ. Pope Paschal in 1118 A.D. condemned the novelty by calling the practice "man-made and brand-new" (*humana et novella; Migne, P.L.* 163, 442; *Mansi* 20, 1013). There is every suspicion that in the later Middle Ages, when the expression "as drunk as a pope" was as common as the

modern expression "as sober as a judge", some wicked bishops used the fear of spilling the true blood as a pretext for not having to buy these great quantities of wine for their laity. The invention of daily Masses, said by Presbyters for a silver denarius, also might have focused attention to the 'cost' of wine.

In the 13th century St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) mentioned the danger of spilling the true blood, but his remarks prove that the cup for the laity still existed (*Summa III*, Q. 80, Art. 12). The local British Synod of Lambeth (1281) is the first synod to decree that the people should be given unconsecrated wine. This British method technically did not withhold the cup (the vessel), but it withheld the "true blood". To promote this invention the British supported the French in their view that the host already contained the true blood. Italy, however, did not support the movement.

The 14th-century Roman Ritual still prescribed that the bishop must distribute the bread and the Deacon the cup. The great amount of wine consumed in tropical Rome at Easter attracted many flies. The Deacons, still following the instructions of the Apostolic Constitutions, chased the insects away with large fans. "This too, was done at Rome down to the fourteenth century" (*C.E.* 9, 793). Later, Rome invented the infamous "straw" (fistula) to prevent spilling. "The use of this reed was against spilling . . . and lasted roughly till about the Reformation. Luther made mock of it" (*Fortescue, Mass*, p. 375).

That the medieval Mass-priest, who said Mass (crucified Christ) as often as seven times a day in order to collect seven silver deniers a day, was not a total victim of "fear" but had ulterior motives for depriving the laity of the wine, is well admitted today. Father Conway gives these two main reasons for withholding the cup: "the risk of spilling the Precious Blood" and "the cost of obtaining wine for

thousands of communicants" (*Question Box*, p. 261). The commercial motive seems more real than all others, because the others apply to the priests and laity alike. If the laity, for example, do not need the cup because the blood is already present in the host, it follows that the priests do not need the cup either and that the institution of the cup must have been a mistake from the very beginning.

The 15th-century Western Church began to condemn Ultraquism, i.e. Communion under both species. The Universities of Oxford and Prague (Bohemia) protested. The Council of Constance (1415), in its popeless 13th session, presented the case as if cupless Communion had been the established rule for 14 centuries and as if the heresy of Ultraquism had been just invented by the followers of John Wycliff and John Hus. The Council refers to the use of the cup by the laity as "a perverse custom which in some part of the world has begun to spring forth" (*Mansi* 27, 727). All Roman Catholic Church historians know that the opposite is true, namely, that the perverse custom of withholding the cup sprung forth during the 14th century. Whether the council was misinformed or dishonest, in neither case was it qualified to pass decrees on biblical teachings and practices.

The murder, perpetrated by this council, made John Hus the first martyr of the cup and a national hero of Bohemia. Fearing another schism (Bohemia is a Slavic nation which racially belongs to Eastern Europe where the cup is not withheld), the Council of Basle in 1433 restored the cup to the Bohemians but forbade the cup to all others (*Mansi* 29, 158). When Martin Luther restored the cup in Germany and John Calvin restored it in France, Rome threw all diplomacy out of the window and through the Council of Trent (1562) condemned the use of the cup under pain of hell (*Mansi* 33, 123). "Not only, therefore, is Communion

under both kinds not obligatory on the faithful, but the chalice is strictly forbidden" (*C.E.* 4, 175).

Within a year after the Council (1564), Rome, fearing the loss of all Germany, was forced to restore the cup to Germany. "In 1564 Pius IV authorized some German bishops to permit it in their dioceses" (*C.E.* 4, 178). Thus, after the death of Martin Luther the Catholics and Protestants of Germany still received Communion under both kinds.

As we mentioned before, the Roman Catholics of the Eastern Rites (Uniates) use the chalice for the laity till this day. "Millions of Catholic Uniates receive both kinds," explains Father Fortescue, "Our practice is not Catholic, but Latin" (*The Mass*, p. 377). Yet the Slavic (Eastern) priest, John Hus, and hundreds of non-Latin Bohemians were murdered for refusing to introduce this new, unscriptural, non-Catholic, Latin custom.

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

In the 14th century a new church service was invented in the West, which is unknown in the East. Besides the liturgical Mass in the morning, a nonliturgical Host-worship service was held in the evening, consisting of placing the Host-god on top of the altar for adoration and of a priestly benediction while the priest holds the Host in his hand. In England this new devotion eventually became known as the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

"In the fourteenth century the practice of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament arose" (*C.E.* 5, 581).

The only extralitururgical public devotions in existence in the 13th century were the "Laudes" (praises), sung in honor of Mary, St. Ann and St. Agnes. The Mary-services were known in France as "Salut" (hail) and in the Low Countries as "Lof" (praise). During the Laudes of Mary and the Saints their relics were "exposed" (exhibited) in reliquaries or

monstrances (glass show cases), hymns were sung, and the devotion was climaxed by an act of adoration, either by prostration or by kissing the relic, or both. The Mary devotions again were borrowed from the sixth-century adoration of the "true" wood of the Cross. In the cross worship the devotee prostrated himself before the relic and exclaimed: "Ave Crux" (Hail the Cross). In the 13th century the "Ave Maria" (Hail Mary) was not a devotional prayer as it is today, but a salutation during which the saluter prostrated himself. The word "Hail" as in "Ave Caesar", is not just a salutation, but implies an act of worship. Thus the 13th-century "Salut" or "Hail" services of France implied an act of adoration.

The new invention of "exposing" the Host for adoration (14th cent.) nearly killed the Mary devotions. By the 15th century new monstrances were manufactured just to fit the shape of the altar bread. The Monstrance again led to the change from the oblong wafer to round hosts. While England and the United States refer to the Host-service as the "Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament", continental Europe till this day calls it by the old Marian name of Laudes, Lof, Salut.

Without the invention of relic and statue worship (6th & 8th cent.) the Exposition of the Host would never have been invented. Statue worship was condemned by the Ecumenical Church and is still condemned by the Greek Orthodox Church. The 8th-century statue worship of the West was based again on relic worship which was based on the legend of having found the "true" cross. As the wood of the "true" cross is not true, but a sixth-century fake relic; as the earliest worship of saints: St. Agnes and St. Ann, was a worship of purely legendary persons; the whole origin of Host-worship is not only illegal and idolatrous, but based on outright frauds.

As there is no end to this procession of inventions, some priest conceived the idea that the Host-god could be made to bless the devotees by taking Him in the hands and going through the motion of a sign of the cross. This benediction by Christ Himself finally gave the name to the entire devotion.

The rubrics for Benediction now prescribe: burning candles, burning of incense, exposition of the monstrance, the singing of the hymns "O Salutaris Hostia" (O saving Host) and "Tantum Ergo", a priest with liturgical vestments, elevation and benediction by the Host in the monstrance. The hymn "Salve Regina" (Hail Queen) still dates from the time that the "Salut" was in honor of Mary.

If this new devotion is very beneficial to the salvation of souls, the Fathers and popes of the first 1300 years made an awful blunder by not thinking of it. The same holds true for the Greek Orthodox and the Protestant world.

TANTUM ERGO

The oldest Eucharistic hymn, *Tantum Ergo*, was composed at the end of the 13th century by the Dominican Order and was falsely attributed to Thomas Aquinas. Rev. Guido Dreves (d. 1909) in his "Analecta Hymnica" has collected the hymns of the church (*Leipzig, 1888; 51 volumes*). Of all the hundreds of hymns composed before the 13th century, not one suggests the worship of a Host. The first lines of the *Tantum Ergo* seem to admit to a novelty: "Tantum ergo sacramentum, veneremur cernui; et antiquum documentum novo cedat ritui." "Such a great sacrament, therefore, we ought to venerate in prostration; and the old type of doctrine must make room for a new rite" (*Feast of Corpus Christi; Breviary or Liber Usualis*).

Tantum ergo is not the beginning of the entire hymn, but the next to the last stanza of the hymn "*Pange lingua*".

This Host-hymn is a direct 'steal' from the *Pange lingua* in honor of St. Agnes, which again was copied from the *Pange lingua* in honor of the wood of the true Cross. The Middle Ages exhibited the Wood and the Nails of the Cross and sang: "Pange lingua gloriosa, praelium certaminis" (*Migne, P.L. 88, 88; Dreves, Analecta hymnica, vol. 50, p. 71; Monumenta Germ. Hist. Auct. vol. 4, p. 27*). In nearly identical words they sang: "Vexilla Regis prodeunt, fulget crucis mysterium" (*Migne, P.L. 88, 95*). While they sang the next to the last stanza: "O Crux, Ave, Spes unica" (Hail thou, O Cross, our only hope), they bowed in adoration before the relics exposed.

When the relic worship of martyrs was introduced, the *Pange lingua* became the model of all hymns in honor of a miraculous relic. The most popular of all early martyrs is the legendary St. Agnes (*Feast-day on Jan. 21 & 28*). While her alleged relics were exposed in a monstrance, her devotees sang the following hymn: "Pange lingua studiose, Regis mei nuptias". The next to last stanza begins with: "Tantum ergo nunc dignare", and the last stanza reads: "Genitori genitoque, Psallat nostra concio; Procedenti ab utroque, compar sit laudatio, Virginalis ipsum quoque, laudet benedictio" (*Dreves, Analecta hymnica, vol. 4, p. 70*).

After the Feast of Corpus Christi (1264) a *Pange lingua* hymn was composed for the adoration of the Host: "Pange lingua gloriosi, Corporis mysterium . . . Genitori genitoque, Laus et jubilatio; Salus honor, virtus quoque, sit et benedictio; Procedenti ab utroque, Compar sit laudatio" (*Breviary, Corpus Christi*).

In order to change the "Laudes" in honor of St. Agnes and St. Mary into an adoration service in honor of the Host, the same melody and the same initial phrases were used as those of the Agnes hymn. This cheap piece of plagiarism is now proudly attributed to the philosophical mind of

the great St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274).

Also composed in the beginning of the 14th century were the following Host-hymns: "Verbum supernum prodiens", of which the next to the last stanza reads: "O Salutaris Hostia"; the hymn "Sacris Solemniis" (with its "Panis Angelicus"); "Adoro te devote" and "Lauda Sion Salvatorem", all of which are attributed to the 'poet' Thomas Aquinas. These last hymns of Host-worship are, from the standpoint of Latin poetry and with regard to melody, extremely beautiful. Together with the "Dies Irae", a funeral hymn which was also composed at this time, these hymns are probably the first and the last Latin liturgical compositions of literary and artistic value. They were sung with organ accompaniment, as organ music had been introduced into the Western churches since the 12th century, in contrast with the East where the organ is outlawed.

MONSTRANCE OR OSTENSORY

A Monstrance or Ostensory (*Latin: monstrare, ostendere, to show*) is a golden or silver show-case to exhibit a consecrated Host behind glass. The first monstrances made exclusively to exhibit a Host during the service of Benediction originated in the 15th century. Prior to that time any golden vessel (ciborium) or reliquary was used for the purpose of adoration.

The forerunner of the Host-monstrance is the relic-monstrance. About the beginning of the 14th century some churches began to exhibit Jew-profaned Hosts in a transparent reliquary. Such exhibitions were not only condemned by canon law, but have nothing to do with the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Not any Host, but only a 'miraculous' Host was exhibited like any other miraculous relic for permanent view and adoration. Augsburg, Germany, falsely claims that it has exhibited a miraculous Host from which

blood had flown as early as the year 1205. The Augsburg Host was exhibited in a box with a peekhole, the attraction for thousands of tourists. England exhibited a Host behind glass in the breast of a statue of Christ. It was the illegal exhibition of relic-Hosts in monstrances which led to the canonical monstrances for ordinary Hosts.

Speaking of monstrances for Hosts, the Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "In the inventories of the thirteenth century they are seldom or never mentioned, but in the fifteenth century they have become a feature in all larger churches" (*C.E.* 11, 345).

The earliest monstrances for Hosts were sometimes called "Tabernacles", to distinguish them from relic monstrances. The Germans called them "Sakrament-Hauschen" (little house for the Sacrament). By the 16th century when some churches began to install permanent, immovable, non-transparent safes in the center of the main altar, this new 'Sacrament House' received the name of Tabernacle, while transparent showcases for Hosts became known as Monstrances, and those for relics were called Reliquaries. By the 16th century all hosts were round. By the 18th century Pope Clement XII (1735) in the so-called *Instructio Clementina* laid down the rubrics for the Adoration of the Host. The Pope prescribed that the glass container of the monstrance and the large Host should have the form of the "Sun", and the monstrance should be built so that "rays" are emitted from this Sun to all sides. The round Host itself must be fastened in a crescent "Moon".

It was in this late era that the mysterious initials, "I H S", were for the first time printed on the Host. The Roman Catholics claim that these initials stand for the Latin: *Jesus Hominum Salvator*, Jesus the Saviour of Men. Some Protestants claim that they are the Greek abbreviation of the word *Jesus* (IHSOYS), while some other Protestant authors claim

that they stand for the Egyptian sun-gods: Isis, Horus and Seb.

The relatively frank admissions by Catholic scholars about the late origin of the Adoration of the Host is the more remarkable for the reason that the Council of Trent (1551; Session 13) made it an article of faith that the *cultus latriae* of the Host is of apostolic origin (*Mansi* 33, 85).

TABERNACLE

A Tabernacle is a safe or strong-box for consecrated hosts. It is immovable and non-transparent, permanently constructed in the center of the main altar, with a golden door facing the congregation. On top of this structure is a throne for the public exposition of the Host.

Martin Luther (d. 1546) had never seen a tabernacle. After his death the novelty originated in Milan, Italy, as a protest against and a compromise or substitute for the permanent exhibitions of Hosts in transparent monstrances. Churches had thousands of dollars invested in relics and statues to attract the tourist (pilgrim). The pre-Reformation Church of Wittenberg (1509) had collected more than 5,000 relics; the Cathedral of Milan had more than 6,000 statues. The popularity of Host-worship endangered the relic and statue worship of the 16th century. Rome was soon in favor of the Tabernacle, but Northern Europe protested till about the 19th century.

"From the sixteenth century it became gradually, although slowly, more customary to preserve the Blessed Sacrament in a receptacle that rose above the altar table" (*C.E.* 14, 424).

This divine storehouse is constantly stocked with extra consecrated hosts so that God dwells permanently in His tabernacle. Because of God's physical presence, Roman Catholics genuflect before entering the pew, the priest genu-

flects whenever passing the altar, and perpetual light has been installed to remind the visitor of God's presence in His tabernacle.

The Hebrew Tabernacle was the habitation of God. The early Christians interpreted Matt. 27:51 and Heb. 9:12 to mean that in the New Covenant God would no longer dwell in buildings, but in the hearts of men. "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands" (*Acts* 7:48; 17:24). "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you" (*I Cor.* 3:16; *II Cor.* 6:16).

Before the ninth century, churches had no sacristies and no special place to preserve altar bread. After the 9th century we find mention of blessed bread being preserved as Viaticum for the sick, contained in a purse laying on the altar, or kept in a cabinet of the sacristy. After 1215 A.D. Rome prescribed that the Viaticum for the sick was to be preserved in a "well-fastened receptacle" in the sacristy. These cabinets came to be built in the wall of the sacristy and were called "Sacarium" (place for sacred things). The Council of Trent, as late as Oct. 11, 1551, still prescribed that the Eucharist was to be preserved in the sacristy "in sacrario" (*Mansi* 33, 83). Not long after the council, Rome adopted the Tabernacle, i.e. she transferred the sacarium of the sacristy to the center of the main altar in order to allow moderate adoration of the Host. Because the non-transparent Tabernacles are less suggestive of Host-worship, the West was slow to adopt them, until forced to do so in the nineteenth century (1863). The East did not adopt the system.

The invention of tabernacles led again to the elevation of the altar, i.e. the building of several steps before the altar. Canon laws prescribe in detail the form of the sanctuary, the kind of oil to be burned in the tabernacle lamp, etc., all of which has to be memorized by the student of "the science of God" (theology).

ALTAR LAMPS

The rubrics of the Roman Ritual prescribe that in front of the tabernacle "at least one lamp should continually burn day and night" (*Rit. Rom. Tit. 4, Chapt. 1, par. 6*). This lamp serves "not only as an ornament of the altar, but for the purpose of worship" (*C.E. I, 354*). The same ritual rules that the perpetual flame of the Altar Lamp may not be fed by electricity or vegetable oil. Only pure "olive oil or bee wax" may be burned therein (*Rituale Romanum; Rome, 1926, p. 123*).

The lamp may only be extinguished when all Hosts have been removed from the tabernacle, which is sometimes done in cases of mixed marriages when the party objects to being married in the priest's rectory. The emptying of the tabernacle now constitutes a temporary secularization of the church building. Through all these new inventions and regulations both the priest and the people have lost all perspective of the essential issues of biblical Christianity.

GENUFLECTIONS BEFORE THE HOST

When the elevation of the Host was introduced the priest did not kneel before it. Today, however, the priest must genuflect before the Host after its consecration and whenever he passes the center of the altar. He genuflects with one knee. When the Host is exposed for adoration the priest prostrates himself on both knees. Whenever the priest opens or closes the tabernacle doors, he must genuflect. In the Communion for the sick (Viaticum) numerous genuflections are prescribed. The people genuflect before entering or leaving the pew. All these rubrics create the impression that the Host-god is not omnipresent, but only there where the 'accidents' of bread are visible.

"The practice of genuflecting has no claim to antiquity

of origin" (*C.E. 6, 427*). The pre-Reformation rituals do not prescribe genuflections for priests. The laity were not officially told to genuflect till the 19th century when the Sacred Congregation of Rites (1876) passed new legislation in these matters. From that time on kneeling benches were installed in all churches and the people were forbidden to sit after the consecration and during other parts of the Mass.

The Ecumenical Church forbade the practice of kneeling in church during the Mysteries: "We have received from our holy Fathers (Council of Nice, canon 20) the canon law that in honor of Christ's resurrection we are not to kneel on Sundays" (*Council of Trullo, 692, canon 90; Mansi 11, 982*).

FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION

The custom of 'exposing' the Host for forty hours "was introduced into the United States by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis in 1854" (*Father Conway, Question Box, p. 263*).

The "Forty Hours" ("Quarantore") is of Italian origin, and was regulated by Pope Clement XII in 1731. Prior to the Reformation (1517) there were no expositions of the Host which lasted longer than one regular service. In 1537 the Church of Milan, and in 1592 the Church of Rome exposed a Host for an indefinite length of time as a shield against the invading Turks. These instances are not related to the institution of the Forty Hours Adoration of the Host.

It took a long time before this novelty was accepted throughout the West. Today, every Roman Catholic church in the United States must once a year celebrate "Forty Hours". The Host is exposed for three days during which time there must be worshippers in church. People are divided into groups who take turns in worship. The closing of the Forty Hours is in great style with all neighboring priests invited to take part in the Eucharistic procession through the aisles of the church.

DAILY COMMUNIONS

The daily Eucharistic celebrations were abolished at Rome in 850 A.D. by Pope Leo IV in order to introduce the new German Mass. In December of 1905, after a lapse of more than one thousand years, Pope Pius X restored "the ancient practice of frequent and even daily Holy Communion" (*Baltimore Catechism*, No. 3, Qu. 318). However, he did not abolish the Mass, the cause of the one thousand year loss of sacramental grace.

The movement to return to daily Communion was based on the theory that two Communion services produce twice the grace of one. There is nothing in Scripture to indicate that salvation can be worked out mathematically. Neither does the tradition of the early church support this view. Sinners were barred from the Mysteries: only the saints partook of the Lord's Supper. If daily Communion is more pleasing to God and more beneficial to the communicant, it logically follows that for one thousand years an allegedly infallible papacy either did not know this or did not care.

The real reasons for Rome's changing practices are not biblical but psychological. In the 9th century Rome had departed from the earlier belief in the immediate Coming of the Lord. In the 20th century Rome wished to instill religious habits in children before they were exposed to what she terms an unbelieving world.

FIRST HOLY COMMUNION

Pope Innocent III in 1215 made auricular confession and annual Communion obligatory to "everyone of the faithful of either sex (omnis utriusque sexus fidelis), after having reached the years of discretion" (*IV Lateran Council*, canon 21; *Mansi* 22, 1007). The age of discretion was between the years of 14 and 16, at the time of their Confirmation, i.e.,

after they had been instructed in the doctrines of their church. Pope Pius X in 1910 changed the year of discretion to the age of seven, but forgot to change the time for the Sacrament of Confirmation. Since 1910 all Roman Catholic children of seven years of age, though not yet confirmed in the faith, are directed under pain of hell to confess their mortal sins to the priest and to receive Communion. The new Roman custom of giving Communion to seven year old children is not based on a better understanding of the Scriptures, for this would convict the popes of error for 1900 years, but rather the result of the 20th-century youth movements and of a new interest in quantitative membership in an era of competitive religions and denominations.

EVENING MASSES AND EVENING COMMUNIONS

Until the middle of the 20th century Rome prescribed that all Masses or Communion services were to be held in the morning. Canon Law prescribes that Mass is to be celebrated any time from one hour before dawn to one hour after Noon (*Canon* 821). The same applies to Nuptial and Funeral Masses. There are a few exceptions to the rule, such as the Viaticum for the dying and Midnight Mass on Christmas.

In 1953 Pope Pius XII allowed Evening Masses and Evening Communion whenever such are approved by the local bishop. This novelty also necessitated a change in the law of midnight fasting before Communion. The Catholic laity resent these changes and the average Mass is still celebrated in the morning, but the stage has been set for the "gradual development" of the Evening Mass.

Again the change has nothing to do with the Scriptures nor with the Sabbath-Sunday controversies. It is not a movement of changing the Communion 'Breakfast' to the biblical Lord's "Supper" (*I Cor.* 11:20), but rather related to the

20th-century custom of day and night shifts in factories, restaurants and transportation. Realizing that Protestant churches hold services on Sunday both in the morning and in the evening, and that many Catholic factory workers and late-sleepers miss Mass and its collection on Sunday mornings, Rome first invented its Sunday "Noon Masses" (lazy man's Mass). When this did not solve her problems, Rome prepared the Catholic laity for a more drastic change: the Evening Mass. Thus Rome keeps changing from daily celebrations to Sunday Masses, from Bishop's Masses to private Masses, from a single private Mass to seven private Masses a day (multiplying grace for profit), from voluntary Masses to obligatory Masses, from free Masses to the sale of Masses, from Morning Masses to Evening Masses. Yet Rome hesitates to change her Latin Mass into a worship which her people can understand.

IS THE MASS A SACRAMENT?

The Roman Mass used to be a Communion service for clergy and laity alike. It gradually developed into a sacrifice, though it still is the Communion service of the priest. As Rome claims that the Mass was instituted by Christ and produces grace ("of infinite value"), the question arises whether the Mass is a Sacrament separate from the Eucharist. To explain this difficulty away, theologians divide the Eucharist into three parts: (1) *Eucharistia in fieri*, the manufacture of the Host-god, that is, the Mass; (2) *Eucharistia in facto esse*, the existence of the Host-god, that is, the consecrated Host preserved in the tabernacle for adoration or other future uses; (3) *Eucharistia in usu*, the act of consuming the Host-god, that is, Holy Communion (see *Prummer, Vademecum*, p. 317). There is not a Father of the Church who would have understood this division; and if some Father had expounded this theory, he would have been

excommunicated by the Ecumenical Church.

We must here conclude our treatise on the Eucharist, though many minor subjects and interesting questions remain to be treated. The question why women must wear a hat in church is usually explained as a mark of respect for the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. The 13th-century papal liturgist, Bishop William Durandus, explains: "A woman must cover her head in church, because she is not the image of God" (*Durandus, Rationale*, I, 3, 47). The Roman Catechism explains that the priest is the only one who can change bread into Christ. "This power is part of the priestly character and is not lost if a priest should unfortunately fall away" (*Balt. Catechism*, No. 3, Qu. 308). If an ex-priest would walk into a bakery and would say: "Hoc est enim corpus meum", he would commit an unlawful act, but he would validly consecrate the entire bakery. In such a case the Roman Church would have to buy up all the bread to prevent it from falling into the hands of unworthy consumers.

The remainder of the Seven Sacraments (Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Priestly Ordination, Extreme Unction, Penance and the Remission text) will be treated in the third volume of this work, because most of them are closely related to the doctrines of Particular Judgment, Purgatory, Limbo and Indulgences, for which there is not enough space left in this volume. Temporarily, therefore, we will terminate here the subject of the Sacraments.

DOCTRINE OF INTENTION

IS THE INTENTION OF THE PRIEST ESSENTIAL FOR THE VALID ADMINISTRATION OF A ROMAN CATHOLIC SACRAMENT?

The Council of Florence (1439) introduced the doctrine of intention (*Pope Eugene IV, Bull "Exultate Deo", Nov. 22, 1439; Denzinger, No. 695*). This Bull met with great opposition. When the Reformers minimized the powers of the priests by emphasizing that salvation is by grace and faith alone, the Council of Trent made the doctrine of intention a dogma of faith by decreeing that the minister of a sacrament must have "at least the intention of doing what the Church does" (*Mansi 33, 101*).

This doctrine holds, for example, that an unbelieving priest who is willing to go through the external liturgical motions of a sacramental rite like Baptism, without having the actual intention of conferring sacramental grace on the recipient, does not administer a valid sacrament. Habitual and interpretive intentions of the minister also invalidate baptisms, absolutions from sin and other sacraments.

The consequences of this new doctrine are without limit and horrifying to Roman Catholics. There are thousands of agnostic priests, many of whom I know personally, who

have not the least intention of conferring grace through sacraments in which they do not believe. Thousands of others have invalidated the sacraments by drunkenness or by habitual and interpretive intentions. Furthermore, there are about two thousand ex-priests in the United States who were forced till the last day before their resignation to go through the external motions of sacraments in which they no longer believed. This condition exists in all countries and has existed throughout the centuries.

From the writings of St. Bernard, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Catherine, St. Bridget, etc., we know that in the Middle Ages the majority of the bishops were faithless politicians who bought their bishoprics from wicked popes and exploited the sacraments for their personal gains. This means that hundreds of agnostic bishops have invalidly ordained thousands of priests who in turn invalidly administered the Sacraments to millions of Roman Catholics. By simple mathematical process their number increased throughout the centuries, so that hardly a person is left who could be reasonably sure that he has been validly baptized. There is no way of knowing whether any priest has been validly ordained, or whether his ordaining bishop was validly baptized or had the intention of ordaining a priest. The present Pope might never have been validly baptized and there is no way of knowing whether he is a Roman Catholic. No Roman Catholic can be sure that he has been validly baptized, that the priest forgave his sins in the confession box, or that the Masses he ordered were of any benefit to his deceased relatives.

Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine explains this doctrine by saying: "No one can be certain . . . that he has received a true sacrament, as no sacrament is performed without the intention of the ministers, and no one can see the intention of another" (*Bellarmino, Works; vol. 1, p. 488*).

DOCTRINE OF PROBABILISM

EVEN THOUGH HE IS 75 PER CENT SURE THAT A CERTAIN ACT IS SINFUL, MAY A ROMAN CATHOLIC GIVE IT THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT AND COMMIT THIS ACT ANYWAY?

The doctrine of Probabilism was introduced by the new Order of Jesuits about the time the Council of Trent approved the doctrine of Intention. It holds that a person, who is not sure whether a certain act or omission is wrong, sinful or unlawful, may perform the act or omit it to his own advantage, if he can find an alibi or pretext in favor of it, i.e., if he can form a probable opinion regardless whether the opposing views are weightier and more probable. As man by nature cannot psychoanalyze himself and has the most biased opinions, this doctrine also has fatal effects.

A Roman Catholic, for example, may break a civil law if he believes that it is unjust or against the interest of his church. In conscience he may cheat the tax-collector, because in his opinion he pays double taxes for public and parochial schools. He may steal from his employer and former employers if in his probable opinion they were unjust in assignments or salaries. He may assassinate a person if he can make himself believe that God wants this man to be assassinated.

"Probabilism as a system had no history prior to the end of the sixteenth century" (*C.E.* 12, 441). The consequences of this Jesuit doctrine were not fully realized until the

17th century when the Jesuits had put it into operation everywhere. Cardinal Francis Buonvisi (1688) condemned the doctrine, fearing that it might lead to the assassination of Emperor Leopold of Austria. All Orders opposed the Jesuits, including Abbe de Rance (1664), founder of the Trappist Order; the Dominican Prof. Concina; the Augustinian scholar, Giovanni Berti; Pope Alexander VII (1667); Pope Innocent XI (1689); and Pope Alexander VIII (1691). Pope Clement XIV finally decreed: "We suppress and extinguish the said Society. We deprive it of all offices whatsoever . . . We abrogate and annul its statutes . . . We declare . . . said Society to be annulled and extinguished for ever" (*Bull "Dominus ac Redemptor" July 21, 1773; "Breve de Clemente XIV", Madrid, 1773*). Yet the Jesuits were powerful enough to force Pope Pius VII to restore their Order (Aug. 7, 1814). Since 1814 the Jesuit doctrine of Probabilism has become a well established doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

This Jesuitical system of casuistry finally corrupted the theological thinking of all religious Orders. Today, all textbooks on Moral Theology carry a chapter on "Occulta Compensatio" (secret compensation). The Dominican monk, Dr. Dom. M. Prummer, holds that in extreme necessity one is allowed to steal as much as is necessary. "The reason is, because in extreme necessity all earthly possessions become common goods" (*Prummer, Vademecum, p. 143*). The Paulist Father, Bertrand Conway, holds that anti-gambling laws and prohibition laws are not binding in conscience, because they are laws of "compulsory self-denial". "The prohibition law is a penal law, not binding in conscience" (*Conway, Question Box, p. 278*). One may tell a lie whenever it can be explained as a mental reservation (*restrictio mentalis*). Thus moral theology has been turned into a science of immorality.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF MARY

IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF EARLY TRADITION?

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary is not concerned with the conception and birth of Jesus, but with the conception and birth of Mary from the womb of her mother, the legendary St. Ann. The doctrine holds that Mary herself was not born in sin, nor ever committed actual sins during her life. Consequently Mary needed neither Baptism nor Redemption.

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is of late Western origin. As it originated after the Final Schism (1054) it is unknown in the East. During the first four centuries all Fathers held that Mary was a sinner like any other human being. From the 5th to the 14th century the Fathers and theologians granted that Mary had remained free from actual sins, but they unanimously agreed that Mary was conceived in sin. This 1300 years of unanimous teaching on the sinful conception of Mary by all Fathers and theologians is the more remarkable because they differ in almost all other doctrines. If one may ever trust 'tradition', this ought to be it.

In the 14th century the Franciscan monks of France began to teach that Mary was conceived without a stain of sin. They were violently opposed by other Orders, especially by the Dominicans who called the Franciscan doctrine a

"heresy". Throughout the 18th century the Dominicans and Redemptorists denied the Immaculate Conception till it was made a dogma of faith in the year 1854.

The early Fathers interpreted John 2:4; 7:5; Matt. 12:48; 26:31; and Luke 2:35 as meaning that Mary was tempted like all men and committed the sin of impatience and of unbelief. St. Ireneus (d. 202), Bishop of Lyons, France, writes: "The Lord reprimanded her untimely haste" (*Migne, P.G. 7, 926*). Bishop Tertullian (d. 230) of Africa writes: "His mother is shown not to have adhered to Him" (*Migne, P.L. 2, 812*). Origen (d. 254), Bible commentator of Alexandria, Egypt, asks: "Do you think that when the Apostles were scandalized, the mother of the Lord was free from scandalization?" (*Migne, P.G. 13, 1845*). St. Hilary (d. 367), Bishop of Poitiers, France, when interpreting the Psalm "Beati immaculati" (Ps. 119:1), denies both Mary's immaculate conception and her assumption: "The virgin who conceived God has yet to appear before the Judgment seat" (*Migne, P.L. 9, 503*). St. Epiphanius (d. 402), Bishop of Cyprus, warns that "the Virgin was not more than human . . . If it is not allowed to worship Angels, how much less the daughter of Anna" (*Migne, P.G. 42, 751*). St. Basil the Great (d. 379), Bishop of Caesarea, interprets Luke by saying: "Simeon prophesied concerning Mary . . . There shall arise a certain wavering in thy soul. Doubt shall affect thee. This is the sword . . . all shall be scandalized in Me" (*Migne, P.G. 32, 963 & 966*).

St. Jerome (d. 420), official Bible translator and interpreter for the Church of Rome, writes: "Are we to suppose that when the Apostles were scandalized that the mother of the Lord was free from scandalization? If she felt no offense at the passion, Jesus did not die for HER SINS. But if 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified by his grace and redeemed' (Rom. 3:23), surely

Mary was also offended at that time. And this is what Simeon prophesied: 'Through thine own soul also . . . the sword of unbelief shall pierce', and thou shalt be struck with the point of the weapon of doubt" (*Migne, P.L. 26, 275*).

St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), Patriarch of Constantinople, and the greatest of all Fathers, writes: "Nor the Virgin herself . . . knew the mystery of the incarnation, nor His brothers believed in Him" (*Migne, P.G. 55, 242*). "What Mary was then undertaking resulted from excessive ambition. She unreasonably annoys Him. Behold her foolish arrogance" (*Migne, P.G. 57, 464*). "He rebuked her, instructing her for the future not to do the same. Because He, though careful to honor his mother, yet cared much more for the SALVATION OF HER SOUL" (*Migne, P.G. 59, 134*).

As it was foretold that the apostles would be scandalized in learning about their Master's death, that one of the apostles would betray Him, that the chief disciple would deny Him, and that Mary's soul would be pierced, the early Fathers were no more scandalized by Mary's peccability than by that of Peter. Yet some modern Latin theologians, pretending to know Greek better than Chrysostom, would rather accuse Christ of sinfully breaking the commandment of God ("honor thy father and thy mother") than admit that Mary showed human frailty.

St. Cyril (d. 444), Bishop of Alexandria, Egypt, explains: "His unexpected suffering gave offence to the very mother of the Lord" (*Migne, P.G. 74, 662*).

In the fourth-century struggle against Arianism, the Catholics began to call Mary "theotokos" (God-bearer) and gradually began to object to the idea that the Saviour was born of a sinner. The new doctrine that Mary had never committed an actual sin in her life was not the result of a better understanding of the Scriptures, but was thought

helpful in combating Arianism which denied the divinity of Christ. Yet all Fathers continued to teach that Mary herself was born in original sin.

St. Ambrose (d. 397), Bishop of Milan, Italy, taught that with the only exception of Christ, "all men ("homines", i.e. male and female) are born in sin" (*Migne, P.L. 16, 490*). St. Augustine (d. 430), Bishop of Hippo, Africa, writes: "Mary descended from Adam and died because of sin" (*Migne, P.L. 36, 335*). "He (Christ) alone was born without sin" (*Migne, P.L. 44, 142 & 171*). "Therefore He alone, who became man while remaining God, never had any sin; nor did He take sinful flesh, though He came from the sinful flesh of His mother" (*Migne, P.L. 44, 174*).

Pope Leo the Great (d. 461), in his fifth Christmas sermon at Rome, taught: "The Lord Jesus Christ alone among the sons of men was born without sin; because He alone was conceived without the pollution of carnal concupiscence" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 211*). Pope Gelasius (492) wrote: "It is the unique characteristic of the Immaculate Lamb to have had no sin at all" (*Migne, P.L. 59, 117-118*). Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) and all his successors till the 14th century taught that Mary was conceived in sin.

The first heresy about Mary's birth arose in the 12th century when the Church of Lyons, France, changed the feast of the "Conception of Ann" into the "Conception of Mary", and began to teach that Mary, like Christ, had been born of a virgin. St. Bernard (d. 1153), who was the 'superior' of the monk-pope, Eugene III, in strong language warned the Canons of Lyons: "not to introduce a new feast, which is foreign to the ritual of the church, which cannot be proved from reason, and which is contrary to ancient tradition. We should not pretend to be wiser or to be holier than the Fathers" (*Migne, P.L. 182, 333*). "Does it not appear more just that Mary, once conceived, stood in need of sanctifica-

tion . . . because sanctity was wanting at her conception?" (p. 334). "But this would be an assertion up to now unheard of . . . She gave birth as a virgin, but she was not brought forth herself by a virgin . . . For although to a few it was granted to be *born* holy, to no one, however, was it granted to be *conceived* holy. So that for this reason the sanctity of conception should remain the privilege of one only, that is, of Him who alone entered in the world without sin in order to purge all" (p. 335). "All others must repeat the sad words of David . . . 'I was conceived in iniquity, my mother conceived me in sin'" (p. 336). "For what reason then should one celebrate the Feast of Conception" (*Migne, P.L.* 182, p. 336).

If this 12th-century French incident may be called a controversy about the "Immaculate Conception" of Mary (a title not used till the 19th century), and not mainly about the virgin-birth of Mary, the heresy of the Conception of Mary was wiped out at its source and did not contaminate the rest of the West. St. Anselm (d. 1109), Archbishop of Canterbury, England, taught: "For the Virgin herself . . . was conceived in iniquity, and her mother conceived her in sin, and she was born with original sin, because she also had sinned in Adam in whom all have sinned" (*Migne, P.L.* 158, 416). Peter Lombard (d. 1164), Archbishop of Paris, taught: "It is correct to say and it must be believed in virtue of the testimony of the Saints that at first she was subject to sin" (*Migne, P.L.* 192, 760). Peter of Blois (1187), Archdeacon of Bath, in his sermons on Mary denies Mary's immaculate conception (*Migne, P.L.* 207, 675).

Entering the 13th century we find no one less than Pope Innocent III (d. 1216) who taught: "The first woman (Eve) was brought forth without sin, but she herself brought forth in sin; the second woman (Mary) was BROUGHT FORTH IN SIN, but she herself brought forth without sin"

(*Migne, P.L. vol.* 217, p. 581). Father Migne innocently comments: "Pope Innocent III could hold this opinion in a matter not yet defined by the Church" (p. 581).

Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), a great Franciscan scholastic of France, writes in his *Summa*: "It was necessary that the Blessed Virgin . . . should contract sin from her parents" (*Summa Theol.* III, ii, 2).

In the days of Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), the new Orders began to weaken and compromise by teaching that Mary was *conceived* in sin, but *born* without sin, that is, some time between her conception and her birth God had cleansed her from original sin by special privilege. St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), Italian Cardinal and General of the Franciscan Order, taught in his Book of Sentences: "The flesh of the Blessed Virgin was not sanctified before animation" (*Sent. Bk III, Part 1, Art. 1, Qu. 1; Opera Omnia, vol.* 3, p. 61). St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) of the Dominican Order taught: "Nothing is handed down in the canonical Scriptures concerning the sanctification of the Blessed Mary as to her being sanctified in the womb; indeed, they do not even mention her birth" (*Summa Theol. Part. III, Qu. 27, Art. 1*), and he concludes: "The flesh of the Virgin was conceived in original sin" (*Summa III, xiv, 3*). St. Albert the Great (d. 1280) and all other *Summa* writers of the 13th century taught that Mary was conceived in sin.

At the end of the 14th century Paris, the capital of heresy, once more introduced the heresy of the Immaculate Conception. The Franciscans at this time had succeeded in driving the Dominicans out of Paris and other French schools, and began to teach that Mary was conceived without sin. The Dominicans, who were still in control of the Inquisition, openly condemned the Franciscans as "heretics", but the latter had become so rich in the indulgence-market that they could buy the protection of Rome.

The Council of Basle in 1439 (Session 36) speaks of the Conception of Mary, but does not define her conception to have been without sin (*Mansi* 29, 182).

St. Antoninus (d. 1459), Bishop of Florence, Italy, and host to the Council of Florence (1439), is the first Roman Catholic theologian to mention the Franciscan heresy in his *Summa*: "A question which nowadays is hotly disputed by the curious and without much benefit, is the subject of the Conception of the Virgin . . . For although nothing has been defined by the Church, the Virgin was conceived in original sin . . . If the Scriptures are well examined and the sayings of the doctors, both ancient and modern, who were very devout towards the glorious Virgin, it is clearly proved from their words that she was conceived in original sin" (*Summa, Part I, Title 8, Chapt. 2; Summa, Verona, 1740, vol. 1, p. 547*).

During the last part of the 15th century the papacy had fallen into the hands of the Franciscans. An immoral Franciscan monk was elevated to the papacy, Pope Sixtus IV (1471), who immediately created his own illegitimate sons cardinals, exploited the Franciscan racket in the sales of indulgences, and was the first to apply indulgences to the souls in Purgatory (*Bull "Salvator noster", Aug. 3, 1476*). When this pope died the Roman newspaper said: "Today has God delivered his people from the power of this unjust man, who, destitute alike of the fear of God and of the love of his fellowmen, sought only the gratification of his avarice and ambition" (*Roman Catholic Professor, John Alzog, Universal Church History, vol. 2, p. 903*). This immoral monk is the first pope to introduce the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary ("*Cum Praeexcelsa*", Feb. 28, 1476; *Denzinger, No. 734*).

At the time of the Reformation (1517) the Augustinian monks supported the Franciscans in their drive for the new

dogma, but the great Dominican scholars, like Cardinal Cajetan (d. 1534), condemned the doctrine. The fact that Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, once preached a sermon on the feast of the "Conception of Mary" does not prove that the doctrine was then accepted throughout the West.

When the Council of Trent on June 17, 1546 (Session 5) had to define the doctrine of Original Sin, it "assembled with the Holy Ghost" and it declared that the sin of Adam "has been transmitted to all mankind" (*Mansi* 33, 27). Unable to overrule the Dominican view and unwilling to offend the rich Franciscan Order, the bishops of the council diplomatically avoided any ruling on the possible exception of Mary.

Bishop Melchior Canus (d. 1560), the Dominican scholar who represented Spain at the Council of Trent (1546), writes: "The doctrine that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin (a peccato originali fuisse penitus liberam) is nowhere taught in the Sacred Scriptures . . . Nor can it be said that this doctrine has descended into the Church by apostolic Tradition, because traditions of this sort cannot have come to us through any other persons than by those early bishops and saintly writers who succeeded the Apostles. But it is evident that these ancient writers did not receive this doctrine from their predecessors" (*Melchor Cano, "De Locis Theologicis", bk 7, chapt. 3; "Opera", Cologne, 1605, p. 356*).

In the 17th century the nepotist, Pope Alexander VII, once more tried to promote the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception (*Bull "Sollicitudo", Dec. 8, 1661; Denzinger, No. 1100*), but the Dominican Order opposed the heresy. As late as the 18th century we find that St. Alphonsus de Liguori, the founder of the Order of the Redemptorists and the most fanatic Mariolator of modern times (author of the "Glories of Mary"), still taught that Mary could not have

been conceived immaculately.

In 1830 the Franciscans originated the legend that Mary had appeared in Paris to Sister Catherine (Zoe Laboure) and had presented the nun with a 'miraculous medal' which happened to have an inscription in the French language: "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us". By 1854 the story of the Miraculous Medal was preached in every Franciscan church for large crowds, but the Dominicans were determined to expose the fraud. Just before the Franciscan-Dominican controversy could explode, Pope Pius IX decided to silence the Dominicans by making the new doctrine an article of faith. On Dec. 8th, 1854 Pope Pius IX, evidently better informed than the entire Council of Trent, declared single-handedly in his Bull "Ineffabilis Deus" that Mary had been "preserved exempt from original sin in the first instant of her conception" (*Denzinger, No. 1641*).

In order to prove the new doctrine, the pope quoted among other texts that of Gen. 3:15 "She (Mary) shall crush thy head". But the pope should have known that the Vulgate Bible has been mutilated. He should have known that St. Jerome not only composed the Vulgate, but wrote a commentary on every book. In his commentary on Gen. 3:15 Jerome says: "He shall crush thy head (*Ipse conteret caput tuum*)" and he explains that this means that "The Lord shall crush Satan" (*Migne, P.L. 23, 991*). Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) explained "He shall crush" in his seventh Christmas sermon by saying that Christ is the only one born free of sin (*Migne, P.L. 54, 217*). That means that Mary was not free from sin. Yet Pope Pius IX dared to use the same text as proof that Mary was free from sin. A ninth-century copy of Jerome's Vulgate, reprinted by Father Migne, reads: "He (Christ) shall crush thy head" (*Migne, P.L. 28, 200*). Hence another Roman forgery has been employed to prove a new doctrine.

Knowing that neither the Bible nor Tradition favors the new doctrine, the Franciscans arranged for another miracle. Four years after the dogmatization of the Immaculate Conception (1858), Mary is said to have appeared at Lourdes to a peasant girl of 14 years and to have revealed to her in broken French: "I am the Immaculate Conception". Notice the grammar: I am a conception. If Bernadette was an innocent little mountain girl of Southern France she had as much chance of understanding the theological phrase: I am conception, as she would the biological term "ovum". The miracle did not convince the Dominican scholars but it gave the Franciscans the support of the people.

Pope Pius IX in 1854 also overlooked the fact that his theologians had taught that the human embryo for two or three months after the conception is inanimated. The first stages of the embryo, they taught, are vegetable life, and the soul is infused later. Papal canon laws about abortion made distinctions between animated and inanimated fetuses. Conditional baptismal rites of fetuses prescribed the formula: "If thou art animated I baptize thee . . .". The Catechism of Trent taught that the soul is united to the body only after a certain lapse of time. Hence Mary could not have been exempt from original sin "in the first instant of her conception" because as an embryo she had no soul and was not a human being. After the promulgation of the new dogma, the Dominican scholars, like Cardinal Lepicier, Cardinal Mercier, Prof. Hugon, etc., continued to teach that the embryo in the first instant of its conception has no soul, thus indirectly denying the Franciscan dogma and still defending the teachings of St. Thomas.

The feast of the Immaculate Conception (19th cent.) is based on the feast of the "Conception of Mary" (12th cent.) which was based on the feast of the "Conception of St. Ann" (8th cent.) which again was based on the spurious Gospel

of St. James (2nd cent.). Hence the whole doctrine developed from apocryphal literature. The Bible does not mention the parents of Mary. The apocryphal Gospel of James produced the names of Joachim and Anna as her parents. Imitating the O.T. story of Samuel, the spurious gospel relates that Anna was sterile and conceived miraculously in the Temple of Jerusalem (in the absence of Joachim) during the Jewish feast of Dedication (Dec. 8th). This apocryphal date is now the official date of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Exactly nine solar months later (Sept. 8), Rome celebrates the Nativity of Mary. The Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "Since this story is apparently a reproduction of the biblical account of the conception of Samuel, whose mother was also called Hannah, even the name of the mother of Mary seems to be doubtful" (*C.E. I*, 538).

Thus an apocryphal conception, "miraculous" in method, was transformed into a dogmatic conception, "immaculate" in origin. Thus the legendary Hannah or Anna became the real Grandmother of God (theo-promotor). The Canadian shrine of St. Ann of Beaupre exhibits her genuine "finger bone" and "wrist bone".

The fourth-century Church of Rome was unacquainted with the doctrine of original sin and supported the heretic, Pelagius, until the African Church in 418 mailed Pope Zosimus a copy of the book by St. Augustine: "De Gratia Christi et de Peccato Originale" (Migne, P.L. 44, 559-610). It seems strange that a church which admits its ignorance about original sin during the early centuries (*C.E. 3*, 431; 5, 78), now claims to know who is exempt from this sin. Protestants cannot understand the logic of Roman traditions, and are only interested in the apostolic traditions which Paul passed on to the Church of Rome in this particular matter: "They are all under sin," explains the apostle. There are no exceptions. "No, not one" (*Rom. 3:9-23*).

ASSUMPTION OF MARY

WHY WAS THE ASSUMPTION OF MARY MADE A DOGMA IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY?

The doctrine of the Assumption is a fraud, perpetrated in France at the very end of the 6th century, adopted by Rome in the 7th century, and sneaked into the Rituals of the Holy Empire in the 8th or early 9th century. The East, never suspecting the fraud, adopted the Western doctrine before the schism, and consequently the Greek Orthodox Church of today also celebrates the Feast of the Assumption of Mary. Those who rejoice in the thought that the Assumption is at least of early tradition, should remember that the Church in the days of Pope Leo the Great (5th cent.) and St. Patrick (5th cent.) was as ancient as the Protestant Church of today. Yet the Assumption was invented 123 years after the death of St. Patrick.

The doctrine of the Assumption holds that there is no cemetery on earth which contains the remains of Mary. Like Christ, her body after death was reunited with her soul and was taken up into heaven. The story of the Assumption

sounded more astounding to the early Christians of France than to the Catholics of today, because 6th-century France did not believe in a Particular Judgment nor in the immediate glorification of the saints. The dead had to wait for the Coming of Christ; only "martyrs" (to which group Mary did not belong) entered into immediate glory.

France was the first in the West to introduce the worship of the "true" wood of the Cross (St. Fortunatus, d. 605; *Migne, P.L.* 88, 88) and France was the first to introduce the worship of the relics of Martyrs (St. Gregory of Tours, d. 593; *Migne, 71, 708*). As nearly all of France was illiterate it is almost certain that one of these two French bishops introduced the Assumption of Mary.

Bishop Gregory of Tours (593) was the first to write a book "On the Glory of the Blessed Martyrs" and is the first to mention the Assumption of Mary (*Migne, P.L.* 71, 708). When France began to dig up the graves of martyrs and began to bisect their bodies and sell their bones, it was discovered that the grave of Mary was nowhere venerated. The embarrassment was easily solved by inventing the story of her resurrection and ascension.

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), contemporary of Gregory of Tours and Fortunatus, did not introduce the feast of Assumption. His successor, Pope Boniface, introduced the worship of martyrs in 610 A.D., for which he used the pagan Roman Temple dedicated to all the gods: "Boniface obtained leave from the Emperor Phocas to convert the Pantheon into a Christian Church . . . It was the first instance at Rome of the transformation of a pagan temple into a place of Christian worship. Twenty-eight cartloads of sacred bones were said to have been removed from the Catacombs and placed . . . beneath the highaltar" (*C.E.* 2, 661). Along with this bone-worship 7th-century Rome adopted the French story of the Assumption.

"The belief in the bodily assumption of Mary, under the influence of the apocryphal writings, is older in Gaul than in Rome . . . The Feast of the Assumption, found in the Sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory, is a spurious addition" (*C.E.* 2, 6). Hence the Roman Catholic experts on this subject not only admit the Assumption story is based on apocryphal literature, but they admit also that the first rituals of the Holy Roman Empire did not have the Feast of the Assumption.

In the days of St. Patrick (d. 461) Rome did not have one feast in honor of Mary, not even that of the biblical "Annunciation". We know which feasts were celebrated in the early church not only from calendars drawn up by councils, and from the feastdays listed in the early rituals, but from the sermons of the early Fathers (Jerome, Augustine, Leo the Great, etc.) who preached on every feastday and preserved their sermons.

At the end of the 6th century a French impostor, pretending to be the Apostle John, and imitating the story of Christ's resurrection and ascension as recorded in the Gospel of John, forged an apocryphal writing under the title of "The Death of the Blessed Lady". Pretending to be an eye-witness to the assumption of Mary, this French author attached the forged signature of the Apostle John to his document, thus creating a new, inspired and apostolic writing. Realizing that the Fathers had never preached a sermon for this feast, the impostor wrote several documents under the name of the Fathers in order to make his invention of apostolic origin. Such a calculated deception in an era of universal illiteracy could only have come from the headquarters of the French Church.

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1907), which was printed before the Assumption was made a dogma (1950), relates the fraud as follows: "The first six centuries did not know

of the tomb of Mary at Jerusalem. The belief in the corporeal assumption of Mary is founded on the apocryphal treatise 'De obitu S. Dominae', bearing the name of St. John . . . It is also found in the book 'De transitu Virginis', falsely attributed to St. Melito of Sardis; and in a spurious letter attributed to St. Denis . . . St. Gregory of Tours (*De gloria Mart.* I, 4) mentions it first. The sermons of St. Jerome and St. Augustine for this feast, however, are spurious" (*C.E.* 2, 6).

Within these few lines another five admitted forgeries are mentioned which introduced the Assumption. Many more could be added. One forger thought of a 'perfect' crime. By having a fifth-century pope condemn the seventh-century book of the "Transitus Virginis", he thought to make the Assumption at least two centuries older without creating much suspicion. He, therefore, forged a papal decree under the name of Pope Gelasius I: "The book which is called the 'Transitus', that is, the Assumption of St. Mary, is apocryphal" (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 162). Today, Roman scholars admit that the whole papal decree is a forgery. If the origin of the Assumption had been legitimate and biblical, it would not have been in need of the impostors of the barbarian church of Gaul.

The apocryphal story of the Assumption of Mary into heaven is related as follows: Mary died a natural death and her body was laid in a tomb at Jerusalem. The apostles, who were preaching in various countries, learned of Mary's death and by miracle they flew through the air and descended around the tomb of Mary. While they were praying, Mary, like Christ, arose from the dead and ascended into heaven. As the apostles were still staring at the clouds, St. Thomas belatedly arrived from India (he must have missed his plane). When informed that Mary had ascended into heaven, St. Thomas, doubting as ever, refused to believe it.

The entire story is a direct 'steal' from the Gospel of John (20:24).

Gregory of Tours (593) writes: "The Lord had the most holy body of the Virgin taken into heaven where, reunited to her soul, it now enjoys with the elect happiness without end." If Gregory was not the author of the "Obitus Dominae", he was the first victim of the fraud. For six centuries Christianity flourished without the fraud and forgery of the Assumption, and by the eighth century it gradually had spread through the West and the East. Since that time Jerusalem is showing its pilgrims two empty tombs, one of the Lord (Domini) and one of the Lady (Dominae).

When the Reformers of the 16th century began to expose the apocryphal nature of Catholic traditions, the Assumption legend became more and more doubted in the West, as this is even evident from the account in the Catholic Encyclopedia. To prevent its total extinction, the pope made the Assumption a dogma of faith (*Nov. 1, 1950; Denzinger, No. 2331*). Roman students should never forget that their own scholars a few years ago admitted that the "belief" in the Assumption is based or "founded" on "apocryphal" literature and fraud.

HAIL MARY

IS THE "HAIL MARY" A PRAYER OR A SALUTATION?

The Hail Mary is the most familiar of all Roman Catholic prayers, but it was unknown during the first thousand years of Christianity. Consequently it is still unknown in the East.

The "Ave Maria" (Hail Mary) started out as a two-word salutation in England after the Schism (1054), but before the Church of England had lost its independence. Rome was slow to adopt it. It probably originated as an act of worship when passing a statue of Mary. "Ave Maria was merely a form of greeting . . . There is little or no trace of the Hail Mary as an accepted devotional formula before about 1050" (*C.E.* 7, 111). Contrary to popular Catholic belief the salutation "Hail Mary" is not biblical.

After 1215, that is, during the days of Thomas Aquinas, the Hail Mary had become a penitential exercise for the forgiveness of sin. During each salutation the penitent monk had to prostrate himself on the ground. As the two-word salutation was rather short for penitential purposes, England

and France lengthened it: "Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb". By the beginning of the 14th century the word "Jesus" was added, for which extra word an extra indulgence was granted by Pope John XXII (d. 1334).

During the days of the Reformation the Hail Mary ended with: "and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Amen". Martin Luther (d. 1546) knew the "Hail Mary" but not the "Holy Mary". When the Reformers pointed out to Rome that their Hail Mary was not a prayer, but a salutation (the Lord's Prayer is a petition for daily bread, forgiveness of sin, etc., but the prolonged Hail Mary had still remained a salutation only), the Church of England added the words: "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, Amen." The words: "Now and at the hour of our death" came much later again. When Rome in 1570 published her first Roman Catholic Ritual for the entire West, the "Holy Mary" was not yet officially adopted and for that reason it cannot be found in the Roman Ritual of today. In the Jesuit Catechism used in 1593 for the conversion of the Philippines we find the Holy Mary as follows: "Holy Mary, Virgin and Mother of God . . . Santa Maria virgen y madre de Dios" (*Doctrina Christiana, Manila, 1593, p. 7*). The Catholic Encyclopedia concurs with this history of the Hail Mary: "For liturgical purposes the Ave down to the year 1568 ended with 'Jesus, Amen'" (*C.E.* 7, 112).

The Aves, like the Paternosters, are today imposed by the priest upon sinners as a form of penance, replacing the corporal punishments and pecuniary fines of the Middle Ages. Thus praying, which formerly was regarded as a privilege of speaking to God, has now taken the aspect of a burdensome chore from which one cannot escape.

CHAPTER TEN

ROSARY

DID ST. DOMINIC INTRODUCE THE ROSARY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY?

During the first thousand years of our era prayer-beads were unknown to Christians. They were used by the Mohammedans whose 'rosaries' have 99 beads. They borrowed this custom of counting prayers from the Buddhists whose 'rosaries' have 108 beads. According to Formosan legends the Chinese rosary was given to the Madonna and Child by a Sacred Black Bird. The Far East used its prayer-beads in penitential exercises to count the prostrations towards the East. As penitential exercises for the 'faithful' was not only considered a contradiction in thought by the early Christians, but also contrary to the biblical teaching of grace which holds that man cannot redeem himself by his own works and by his own merits (*Eph. 2:8; Rom. 11:6*), there was no room for prayer-beads prior to the Anglo-Saxon penitential system.

After the First Crusade (c. 1110), when Christians had been exposed to Mohammedan customs, the Eastern and Western churches borrowed the pagan beads for their monks. Hence the invention of Christian prayer beads is usually attributed to Peter the Hermit (d. 1115), who preached the first crusade. The Eastern monks began to use 103 Kyrie-beads and repeated at each bead: "O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me a sinner." The Western monks used the new invention as Paternoster-beads to count the Lord's Prayer. Instead of beads, the monks tied knots in their sash cord for counting their "Our Fathers". The Rule of St. Francis (1223) says that Lay Brothers are excused from the Divine Office and instead must recite 76 Our Fathers (*Bullarium Rom. Turin ed., vol. 3, p. 395*). Illiterate monks who were unable to read the 150 Psalms were instead allowed to recite the Lord's Prayer 150 times. This Western custom led to stringing 150 beads on a circular wire. Both the knotted cords and beaded strings are part of the monastic garb of today.

In the days of St. Dominic (d. 1221), the founder of the Dominican Order, and of St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), the only prayer-beads in existence were paternoster-beads used in monasteries. It was not till 1460 that Alaine de Rupe introduced the Ave-beads to the West, which soon became known as a "Rosary". Polydore Vergil (1499) is the first to describe this new mode of Mary-worship. The name "Rosary" and "Mysteries" originated at the end of the 15th century.

The Dominican Order in 1460 sent the monk, Alaine de Rupe (Alanus), throughout Western Europe to preach the new Rosary. Alaine claimed that Mary had appeared to him and that she had told him about her appearance in 1210 to the founder of his order, St. Dominic, whom she had given the following instruction in Latin: "Introduce the Rosary devotion everywhere . . . I promise you that I will

prove by my graces how pleasing this devotion is to Me and how profitable to the faithful." It is evident, however, from the medieval penitentials, rituals, benediction forms, prayer books, etc., that the Rosary did not exist during the 13th and 14th centuries, that the Ave-beads originated 250 years after St. Dominic (1210) and that the Paternoster-beads originated 100 years before St. Dominic.

As the Rosary was invented 23 years before the birth of Martin Luther, the Reformers naturally did not preserve this new form of Mariolatry. Pope Pius V in 1571 officially ascribed the origin of the Rosary to St. Dominic (13th cent.). Pope Gregory XIII (1580) approved locally the first feast of the Most Holy Rosary, which feast Pope Clement XI in 1716 extended to the entire Roman Catholic Church. Pope Leo XIII (d. 1903) once more proclaimed the Mary-Dominic *rendezvous* a historical fact, elevated the feastday of the Rosary to a higher liturgical class and composed a new Mass and liturgy for it. The new Ritual for October 7th relates the Rosary-miracle as follows:

"When the heresy of the Albigenses was damnably raging through the country of Toulouse, . . . St. Dominic . . . implored the help of the Blessed Virgin. By her, so tradition asserts, he was instructed to preach the Rosary to the people as the single antidote to heresy and sin . . . From this time on, this pious mode of praying was introduced by St. Dominic and began to flourish in an extraordinary manner. The Supreme Pontiffs in many places of their Apostolic Letters have declared that he (Dominic) is the Inventor and Author of this devotion (*institutorem auctoremque*) . . . And other Pontiffs have bestowed almost innumerable indulgences on those who recite the Rosary, and on the Sodalities of the same Rosary" (*Roman Breviary, Oct. 7*).

The Rosary was a Dominican monopoly, just as the Stations of the Cross started out as a Franciscan monopoly. As

the Orders gave large fees to the pope whenever they requested new indulgences, the papacy gladly subscribed to these projects of the monks and was willing to cover up any fraud. Consequently the Catholic people consider the apparition of Mary to St. Dominic a historical fact. Thousands of statues and church windows today depict the miraculous origin of the Rosary. The Ladies of the Holy Rosary Sodality of Fargo, N.D., for example, spent thousands of dollars on a huge cathedral window depicting a life-size figure of Mary holding the Christ child with her left hand, and with her right hand giving the miraculous Rosary to St. Dominic.

In the Catholic Encyclopedia the biography of St. Dominic is written by a Dominican monk. Speaking of the year 1213 the author informs us "that the devotion of the Rosary, which tradition says was revealed to Saint Dominic, had come into general use about this time" (*C.E.* 5, 107). If the same encyclopedia had given the story of the "Rosary" to the same Dominican, everything would have been centered around the founder of his Order. Instead, the encyclopedia gave the story of the rosary to a Jesuit who tears it to shreds. He exposes the whole fraud of Mary's apparition and ridicules the papal bulls which confirm the story. "Pope Leo XIII," states the Encyclopedia through this Jesuit, "assumes the institution of the Rosary by St. Dominic to be a fact historically established." "We have positive evidence," continues the Catholic Encyclopedia, "that both the invention of the beads as a counting apparatus and also the practice of repeating a hundred and fifty Aves cannot be due to St. Dominic . . . The practice of meditating on certain definite mysteries, which has been rightly described as the very essence of the Rosary devotion . . . was not introduced until two hundred years after his death." Defying all papal Bulls and Rituals to the contrary, the learned Jesuit cries out: "What then, we are compelled to ask, is there left of which

St. Dominic may be the author?" (C.E. 13, 186).

After these preliminary remarks the Jesuit begins to produce fact after fact which even the most fanatical Catholic cannot digest without upsetting his faith in tradition:

1. From the writings of St. Dominic himself. How could he have forgotten to mention his miraculous *rendezvous* with Mary, and his precious possession of the first Rosary, made in heaven?
2. From his biographers: "Of the eight or nine early Lives of the saint, not one makes the faintest allusion to the Rosary" (C.E. 13, 186).
3. From the Bulls of canonization by Gregory IX in 1234. Though several genuine miracles are required for canonization, the papal Bulls are silent about the Rosary-miracle.
4. From the thousands of devotional works published by the Dominican monks between 1210 and 1460. The Dominicans themselves had never heard of a Rosary.
5. From sculptures, paintings, pictures, church windows, statues, Dominican monasteries, etc. They are all as silent as Dominic's tomb till the year 1460.

In other words, the Catholic Encyclopedia seems to inform us that the Rosary-miracle is a Dominican fraud and that the Ave-beads were invented in the 15th century when the two-word salutation "Hail Mary" had been lengthened to "Blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Amen."

Though the Rosary did not exist in the 13th century, Roman Catholics are told today that the extermination of an entire denomination—every man, woman and child of the Albigenses—was accomplished through the Rosary. The Rosary is said to have stopped the Turks and to be a mighty weapon against the Protestants. In 1917 Mary is said to have appeared at Fatima and to have recommended the Rosary as an antidote to Communism. The Portuguese Lady of Fatima (1917) evidently did not know that the Catholic

Encyclopedia in America (1907) had already exposed the Rosary-fraud, and that this "full and authoritative information" carries the *imprimatur* of the Cardinal of New York.

For the convenience of laymen the modern Rosary (Rosarium: garland of roses) has been reduced from 150 to 50 beads, strung on a circular wire or chain. It still is as much a counting apparatus as the beads above a pool table. Each time one recites the man-made prayer "Hail Mary" one skips a bead. When one has thumbed his way through the entire Rosary one knows that the same prayer has been repeated 50 times. Hence the Rosary is a primitive adding machine, still used to count the Hail Marys imposed by the priest for penance. The use of the Rosary, like so many other Roman inventions, makes a serious consideration of "merger" of Bible Christians with Roman Catholics impossible. We would rather expect a movement to unite all bead-counting religions into one fold.

When a Rosary is duly blessed by a priest it is called a Sacramental and it produces grace, blessings and indulgences. Consequently they are referred to as Holy Rosaries, like Holy Medals, Holy Scapulars, Holy Water, etc. Because of their sacramental character Rosaries are worn on the body, in one's pocket or purse, and placed in the hands of the dead.

Like the recitation of Masses and Breviaries, the valid recitation of the Rosary does not require the understanding of the words recited. The ritualistic performance in itself produces grace. While outwardly reciting the Rosary the Roman Catholic must inwardly meditate on the "Mysteries" or events in Mary's life. Again one can validly attend Mass on Sunday by reciting the Rosary, that is, while the priest recites one thing, the Mass 'hearer' recites another thing while thinking about a third thing.

The Reformers rejected the recitation of Rosaries, because it is contrary to Scripture. When Christ introduced

the Lord's prayer, He warned: "When you pray, use not vain repetitions like the heathen, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (*Matt. 6:7*). He warned against automatic recitations without understanding the text (*Mark 7:6*). To pray to a human being, as Mary is, and to believe that she can understand prayers said in Japanese and Chinese, in Germany and in Canada, is to believe that Mary is like God: omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent. To hold that Mary is the Door of Heaven (*porta coeli*), that no one can enter heaven except through her, that she answers all prayers (*Memorare*), that she is the Refuge of all sinners (*Ave Maria*), that she is the dispenser of all graces, that she is our Hope and Advocate (*Salve Regina*), that she is our Mediatrix (female mediator) and co-redeemer of the human race, is contrary to biblical teachings (*John 10:9; 14:6; I John 2:1; I Tim. 2:5; Acts 4:12*).

If Rome honestly believed that the Rosary with all its indulgences is so beneficial to salvation she would have to impose the Rosary on the Roman Catholics of Eastern Europe. This she has never dared to do: "The recitation of the Rosary, as practised in the West, has not become general in the Eastern Churches . . . Among the Greek Uniates the Rosary is but little used by the laity" (*C.E. 13, 187-188*).

The Reformers, therefore, began to pray again to God in Jesus' name. It is for this correct mode of praying that the prayers of the Roman Missal are still directed to God and end with the phrase: "per Christum Dominum nostrum". What honest Bible scholar can imagine that Christ told his followers: If you want something, ask my mother. Christ said: "Whatsoever you ask in My name" (*John 14:14*).

SCAPULARS AND MEDALS

BLESSED SCAPULARS

The Scapular privilege is a Carmelite fraud, perpetrated in the beginning of the 15th century and falsely attributed to Simon Stock (13th cent.).

During the first thousand years of Christianity there were no scapulars in existence, nor did the West have various Orders of monks. The Benedictines (6th cent.) are the oldest Western monks and for many centuries remained the only Western Order. Before the Franciscan and Dominican Orders came into existence (13th cent.), a man by the name of Berthold (d. 1195) founded the Carmelite Order. He was a dishonest man and is about the only founder of a religious Order whom Rome has refused a place in her ritual. He falsely claimed that his Order was older than that of the Benedictines, and that it had been founded in the Old Testament (10th cent. B.C.) by the Prophet Elijah on Mount Carmel (*I Kings 18:42*). The Catholic Encyclopedia does not seem to believe his story and comments: "He is often called the founder" (*C.E. 1, 701*). Because of this and other false claims the Carmelites met with great opposition.

There are two kinds of scapulars: (1) the garment of a monk and (2) a sacramental for the laity. The latter developed from the former. The scapular as a full length garment of the monk may have been introduced by the Carmelites sometime

in the 13th century, but the myth that Mary gave the scapular to Simon Stock originated in the 15th century. Roman scholars themselves hold that the Mary-Simon Stock *rendez-vous* is a legend, that the Marian privilege of the scapular could not have originated before the year 1379 (about which later), and that it probably originated in the 15th century.

The monastic scapular is a long, narrow strip of cloth with an opening in the center for the head, covering the entire front and back, but leaving the sides open like a chasuble. If Simon Stock (1251), in the days of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, invented this garment, he probably meant it to be a chastity cloth. Certainly no celestial privilege or purgatorial indulgence was attached to any garment in the 13th century, nor was the scapular listed among the multa sacramenta.

In order to encourage British boys to join the unpopular Order of the Carmelites, a story was circulated in the 15th century, saying that Mary had appeared to Simon Stock in person and had promised that anyone who died in a Carmelite Scapular would be saved. Once invested, the monk was never allowed to remove this garment. As monks were forbidden to take baths, the scapular was no problem except on hot summer nights when they had to sleep in it. As it was never taken off for laundering it became a menace to public health, but was considered an infallible way to enter heaven.

Though there is nothing "pious" about telling falsehoods (see Rev. 21:8) and about misleading people in matters of salvation, the 15th-century Carmelites began to spread the "pious legend" that Mary had appeared to Simon Stock, had presented him with a monastic scapular tailored in heaven, and had given him detailed instructions in Latin about this garment, guaranteeing that the wearer shall be protected against all danger of Hell fire.

"According to a pious tradition the Blessed Virgin appeared

to Simon Stock at Cambridge, England, on Sunday, 16 July, 1251 . . . and said: 'Take, beloved son, this scapular of thy order as a badge of My confraternity . . . whosoever dies in this garment, will not suffer everlasting fire' (C.E. 13, 511). "The Mother of God appeared to Simon Stock with the scapular of the order in her hand. This scapular she gave him with the words: 'Hoc tibi . . . This shall be the privilege for you and for all Carmelites, that anyone dying in this habit shall be saved' (C.E. 13, 800). "In the rules of the religious it is expressly prescribed under penalties that even at night the scapular must be worn" (C.E. 13, 508).

In order to understand the clash of the Carmelite frauds with the historical evolution of the doctrine of Purgatory, we must give here a few dates of Purgatory, though the subject is more fully covered in the third volume.

- 1243 Pope Innocent IV establishes the name of "Purgatory" (*Mansi* 23, 582) for the older names of Middle Place or Limbo. His Purgatory still lasts till the Last Judgment and does not provide for releases prior to the Coming of Christ.
- 1273 Thomas Aquinas still teaches the old doctrine of Limbo, and the Purgatory of Pseudo-Thomas has no pre-Resurrectional releases (*Summa, Suppl. III, Qu. 71, Art. 6*).
- 1321 The Purgatorio of Dante (d. 1321) is still the peaceful abode of the dead awaiting the Judgment Day.
- 1333 Pope John XXII, like all his predecessors, still does not teach the doctrine of a Particular Judgment and of an Immediate Glorification of the dead (C.E. 8, 551).
- 1439 The Council of Florence establishes the doctrine of Purgatory, but the East rejects it.
- 1476 Pope Sixtus IV is the first to apply the Church's Treasury of Indulgences to the souls in Purgatory (Bull "Salvator noster"). All indulgences granted before this date applied to priest-imposed penances.

The dates related to the Carmelite Scapular are as follows:

- 1251 Mary guarantees that the Carmelite Scapular is a sure protection against the fires of Hell ("Pious tradition").
- 1322 Pope John XXII guarantees that the wearer of the Carmelite Scapular will be released from the fires of Purgatory on the first Saturday after the wearer's death (Spurious Bull "Sacratissimo").
- 1379 Pope Urban VI grants the Carmelite Order an indulgence of three years and three quarantines (Authentic sale).
- 1480 Baldwin Leers is the first human being to mention the purgatorial privilege attached to the Carmelite Scapular.
- 1535 The Reformation popes ratify the spurious Bull of John XXII, but grant the other Orders the same privileges.

In the fourteenth century, as is evident from the 14th-century funeral hymn "Dies Irae", no one ever mentioned or cared about the fires of Purgatory. After the 15th century had introduced the gigantic flames of Purgatory, the Carmelite privilege had to be altered or augmented. A second Carmelite indulgence was introduced and came to be known as the "Sabbatine Privilege", because on every Sabbath Mary descends into Purgatory and releases those who have a Carmelite scapular. The apocryphal Bull of John XXII cannot be found in the papal records of the 14th century, but is first mentioned by the Carmelite monk, Baldwin Leers (d. 1483). Father Daniel Papebroch and Father J. Hilgers are the principal Jesuits who have studied the Carmelite fraud and have exposed it widely. The Catholic Encyclopedia exposes it as follows:

"The name Sabbatine Privilege is derived from the apocryphal Bull 'Sacratissimo uti culmine' of John XXII, 3 March, 1322. In this Bull the pope is made to declare that the Mother of God appeared to him, and most urgently recommended

to him the Carmelite Order . . . The Blessed Virgin asked that John . . . should ratify the indulgence . . . she herself would graciously descend on the Saturday (Sabbath) after their death and liberate and conduct to heaven all who were in purgatory" (C.E. 13, 289).

The Catholic Encyclopedia, without differentiating between penitential and purgatorial indulgences, rightly wonders why the Carmelites begged Pope Urban for a small indulgence (1379), if the full privileges of 1251 and 1322 had already been granted: "It is difficult to understand why, instead of asking for this indulgence (1379), they did not appeal to the old promise and the recent 'Bulla sabbatina', if the scapular was then known and the promise to Simon Stock and this Bull were genuine and incontestable" (C.E. 13, 289-290).

In other words, the Catholic Encyclopedia doubts that the Carmelites at the end of the 14th century had ever heard of the existence of the pious legend of Mary's apparition to Simon Stock (1251) and of the apocryphal Sabbatine Privilege which Mary promised to Pope John (1322). It further concedes that "There can be no doubt that during a great part of the Middle Ages papal and other documents were fabricated in a very unscrupulous fashion" (C.E. 3, 57). So much for the 'tradition' of the Carmelite Scapular.

When the envying and quarreling Orders began to expose the Carmelite fraud and the whole scandal was about to explode at the time of the Reformation, Rome hurriedly legalized the fraud by ratifying the spurious Sabbatine Privilege. "The Bull of John XXII was ratified by some later popes in the sixteenth century" (C.E. 13, 290). As two wrongs do not make a right, the Jesuits still disputed the authenticity of the Bull in the 17th century. In order to silence all Orders the popes not only approved something that was of illegal and fraudulent origin, but they granted the same privileges

(legalized rackets) to all Orders.

At the end of the 16th century the Carmelites extended the scapular indulgences by allowing their Confraternities (laity who followed some rules of the Order) to wear the monastic scapular. Soon the other Orders followed. This led to reducing the size of the scapular. By the 19th century all lay persons could enroll in this new way of salvation by wearing underneath their clothes two tiny pieces of cloth, that is, the layman's scapular. The wearer received the following guarantee: "Whosoever, therefore, even though he be now a sinner, wears the badge of the Mother of God . . . Mary will . . . procure for him all the necessary graces for a true conversion and for perseverance".

"The history of the origin of the first four small scapulars is still to a great extent obscure. It is probable that the revival of the religious life in the sixteenth century (the counter-reformation) gave the chief impetus to the development of the scapulars . . . Under Leo XIII, in 1900, were approved the Scapular of the Sacred Heart . . . The Scapular of the Immaculate Heart of Mary . . . originated in 1877" (*C.E.* 13, 510).

Since the 19th century the Carmelites peddle their little brown scapulars to the laity, the Lazarites use red scapulars, the Servites have black ones, the Trinitarians white ones, the Theatines have blue ones, etc., and all of them have various kinds of indulgences attached to them. "There are sixteen small scapulars used by Catholics. Each consists chiefly of two small squares of woolen cloth joined by two strings" (*Catholic Layman's Book of Etiquette*, by R. C. Broderick, St. Paul, Minn., 1956, p. 171).

Martin Luther (d. 1546) had never seen two pieces of cloth around a layman's neck. He believed that salvation is by faith, not by garments. In spite of their medieval frauds the Carmelites of the 20th century were permitted to issue

to the American soldiers of World War II a new "Scapular Militia" which repeated the fraudulent guarantee of Mary: "Whosoever dies clothed in this scapular shall not suffer eternal fire."

SCAPULAR MEDALS

When the sacred medal became popular at the turn of this century, it became a great competitor of the scapular. At this time numerous Roman Catholics wore as many as four different scapulars (eight unwashable pieces of cloth), because different kinds of benefits were attached to the various brands. Many American Catholics began to object to the cloth, and began to wear the newly invented medals. When the scapular faced extinction, the monks sought permission of the pope to transform their scapular cloth into a piece of metal. Thus the Scapular Medal came into existence in 1910 when Pope Pius X attached to one tiny scapular medal of metal all the indulgences which formerly had been granted to the various scapulars of cloth (*C.E.* 10, 115; 13, 510).

The scapular started out as a full length chastity cloth, covering the contours of monks and nuns. Without the apparent permission of Mary it went through several evolutions, and it is now made of a piece of metal, not large enough to hide a wart. It would be rather naive for Protestants to ascribe its design to the mind of an omniscient God, while Roman Catholic scholars themselves admit that its origin was fraudulent.

BLESSED MEDALS

"The use of blessed medals began with the revolt of the Gueux in Flanders, A.D. 1566" (*C.E.* 10, 114). Hence Martin Luther (d. 1546) missed the grace of this new sacramental by twenty years.

A sacred medal is usually a round piece of metal with the

image of a Saint engraved on it. It is customarily worn on a chain around the neck. When blessed by a priest in accordance with the liturgical formula prescribed by the Ritual, the medal becomes a sacramental or amulet, guaranteed to protect the wearer. Blessed medals may now also be found in cars to prevent accidents, on hospital beds to prevent death, or even in U. S. satellites to guarantee orbit.

As the invention of indulgences was due to the Crusades and to the fanatic courage of the Turks, so the invention of blessed medals was due to the Protestant Reformation. Some Protestant Rebels in the Low Countries revolted against their Spanish oppressors. When these Dutch rebels in 1566 began to wear badges to identify themselves, the Spanish soldiers received sacred medals to protect them against the Protestant Gueux. The use of this medal was for a special occasion and for a special group. Not until the 19th century did the laity begin to wear medals around their necks.

Almost every Roman custom is of pagan origin, and so is the origin of the superstitious belief in medals. The fourth century abolished paganism by law and practically forced the pagans to embrace Christianity. Naturally these pagans attempted to preserve as many of their traditions as the Christian church would allow them. For this reason the Council of Laodicea found it necessary to condemn the wearing of medals under pain of excommunication: "They who are of the Priesthood (bishops) or of the clergy, shall not be magicians, enchanters, numerologists or astrologers; nor shall they make what are called 'Medals' ('amuleta') which are chains for their own souls. And those who wear such, We command to be cast out of the Church" (*Mansi* 2, 569).

"The use of amulets in pagan antiquity was widespread . . . We find many of the Fathers of the fourth and later centuries protesting more or less vigorously against these phylacteries

. . . Little evidence exists of the use of medals in the Middle Ages. No traces of such objects survive . . . Among the benediction forms of the Middle Ages no single example is found of a blessing for numismata" (*C.E.* 10, 111-114).

Though Pope Pius is said to have blessed the first Catholic medal in 1566, the laity began to wear protective medals after 1894. The origin of the lay medal is based on a Franciscan 'tradition' which holds that Mary appeared to Sister Catherine in Paris (1830) and gave her a miraculous medal engraved in heaven.

As Sister Juliana, St. Dominic, St. Simon Stock, St. Margaret Mary Alacoque and St. Bernadette are respectively known as the Apostles of the Adoration of the Host, the Holy Rosary, the Blessed Scapular, the Sacred Heart Worship and of the Immaculate Conception, Sister Catherine of Paris (Zoe Laboure) is known as the Apostle of the Miraculous Medal. According to a pious tradition Mary appeared in 1830 to St. Catherine and gave her a medal engraved in heaven. As we mentioned before, this medal was a Franciscan scheme to push the dogmatization of the Immaculate Conception (1854). The inscription of the medal reads in French: "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to Thee". As in the case of Our Lady of Fatima (Portugal), Our Lady of Naccedah (Wisconsin), etc., Rome waited till all opposition and criticism had died down and all alleged witnesses had passed away, before she revived the story of the Miraculous Medal. In 1894 Pope Leo XIII declared the miracle authentic and instituted the Feast of the Miraculous Medal. Since that date the Orders engage in the sale of medals. The first medals were those of Mary. Medals of Jesus and of other Saints came later. In 1910 the Scapular Medal was introduced, guaranteeing the sinner the presence of a priest at the hour of death.

SACRED HEART WORSHIP

WAS MARTIN LUTHER ACQUAINTED WITH THE SACRED HEART WORSHIP?

Not satisfied with worshipping the statues and relics of Mary, France in the 17th century began to worship the "Heart" of Mary and introduced the first statues of the Lady with her heart hanging on the outside. Sometime later the Heart-of-Jesus worship was introduced.

"The feast of the Holy Heart of Mary was celebrated for the first time in 1648, and that of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in 1672" (*C.E.* 5, 596).

The dates of origin, given by Catholic authors, differ greatly. In any case, sometime in the 17th century, some 125 years after the death of Martin Luther, France introduced another novelty in idolatry which was new to Paris, and unknown to Berlin, Constantinople and New York City. Rome refused to approve the movement as long as the originators were alive (1690). When the French Jesuits became interested in the Eudists, the Sacred Heart movement received a new boost. Pope Clement XIII in 1765 finally approved the French Feast and Office of the Sacred Heart, and in the 19th century Pope Pius IX (1856) adopted the feast for the entire Western Church.

As always, the Breviary and Roman Catholic authors try

to make the origin of the worship of the Heart of Jesus older than it really is, by using an anonymous writing which makes mention of the Sacred Heart and which they variously attribute to St. Bernard (12th cent.) or to St. Bonaventure (13th cent.). They go so far as saying that as early as the 13th century two Benedictine nuns, St. Gertrude and St. Mechtilde, had a miraculous *rendezvous* with the Apostle John who spoke about the Heart worship, but the whole deal was unsuccessful. The Catholic Encyclopedia insists that "From the thirteenth century to the sixteenth century, the devotion was propagated, but it did not seem to have developed in itself" (*C.E.* 7, 165). Even if it could be proved that this devotion originated in the 12th or 13th century, it still would be purely Roman Catholic, purely Western and Latin, and contrary to the Bible and contrary to one thousand years of tradition. But there is no proof of any liturgical worship of Hearts prior to the 17th century. Secondly, the worship of Mary's Heart was certainly not propagated prior to the 17th century.

Father John Eudes (1601–1680) founded a new Order which he humbly called the Order of the Eudists (1644). Like all new Orders he needed a gimmick or monopoly to get publicity and finances for his venture. For this reason he wrote a book on "The Liturgical Worship of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary" which his Order sought to promote but without success. He also founded a strange Order for females, the Order of Charity for wayward girls. "For female sinners he founded the Order of Charity, to recall them to a Christian life" (*Breviary*, Aug. 19). This Order is known in the United States as the Good Shepherd Convents. When his book did not sell, Father Eudes arranged for a miracle. He was far from popular during his lifetime, but in 1925 he was finally canonized a Saint, befitting the founder of any Order.

Sister Margaret Mary Alacoque (1647–1690) is now called the Apostle of the Heart worship. In 1660, as a starving French peasant girl of thirteen, Margaret frequented the rich monasteries of Paris and entertained the monks by showing them her self-inflicted wounds and stigmata, a common practice of the time. When pretty Margaret was 17 and her father had made some money, she no longer needed the monasteries and enjoyed the night life of Paris, as did many of the Parisian monks. While Margaret was still dancing in night clubs, Father Eudes had already published his book on Heart-worship. However, in 1672 Margaret was rushed through her solemn vows, joined the Order of Father Eudes and by miracle received instructions from Christ to popularize the Heart worship. Christ in person is said to have appeared to the new nun (*C.E.* 7, 166; 9, 653), but the popes remained very skeptical. She was not canonized a Saint till 1920.

There is little evidence that Heart worship had become popular in France during the first century of its invention (1648–1765), except among the small group of Eudists. Neither was the new fad too popular outside of France during its first two centuries (1648–1856). It seems to have benefited from the fact that the Order of Charity secretly sheltered the French Jesuits when their Order was outlawed (1773–1814). Not until the 19th century was the Sacred Heart worship encouraged by all dioceses. Today the secret, plain-clothes Orders of nuns and monks are dedicated to the Sacred Heart. The Jesuits further intended to use the idea of the “Two Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary” to promote a new dogma of Mary as co-Mediator and co-Redemptor of the human race. Thus a legend or falsehood by a wayward girl can change ‘tradition’ and introduce a new way of salvation.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

NOVENAS AND FIRST FRIDAYS

NOVENAS

“Not until the nineteenth century did the Church formally recommend novenas” (*C.E.* 11, 143).

The number *nine* (Latin: *novem*) was the ‘lucky’ number of pagan Rome. The pagan Roman priests, for example, offered nine consecutive sacrifices for the dead (*Livy* I, 31). “Novena (from *novem*, nine), a nine days’ private or public devotion in the Catholic Church to obtain special graces” (*C.E.* 11, 141).

A novena is a series of nine consecutive devotions in honor of a certain Saint in order to make a certain wish come true. A Saint may be selected according to the particular powers attributed to him: St. Acasius for headaches; St. Agatha for breast cancer; St. Andrew protects you against sudden death; St. Anne for childbirth; St. Benedict against poison; St. Blase for throat diseases; St. Cyriac for diabolic possessions; St. Dymphna for nervous diseases; St. Francis for the deaf; St. Gerard against dangers in pregnancy; St. Giles against insanity; St. Hubert for hydrophobia; St. Jude for hopeless cases; St. Lucy for eye diseases; St. Maurice for gout; St. Odilia for the blind; St. Pantaleon for tuberculosis; St. Peregrine for male cancer patients; St. Rita for impossible things;

St. Rock for skin diseases; St. Sebastian for contagious diseases; St. Vitus for epileptics; St. Anthony for lost articles; St. Apollonia against thunder and lightning; St. Catherine against fire; St. Scholastica against drought (for rain); etc. Every profession like barbers, blacksmiths, butchers, bakers, brewers, cooks and cabinetmakers, have their patron Saints. The patron Saint for "old maids" is St. Andrew (*M. F. Wedge, You and Your Patron Saints; St. Paul, 1955; p. 60*).

A woman, for example, can be cured of breast cancer by attending a novena in honor of St. Agatha. If the monks in some city happen to conduct such a novena on Thursday evenings, the woman must attend the services for nine straight weeks. If she misses one Thursday because of guests, a flat tire, or because of the disease itself, she must start all over again. The magic lies in the lucky number 'nine'. For this reason it is called nine-worship or novena.

Most novenas are in honor of St. Mary, St. Joseph or St. Jude, because lesser Saints would draw smaller crowds. Novenas also draw steady crowds, because those who have already attended five or six times are not likely to skip one service under any circumstance. During the novena, prayers and hymns are offered to the Saint and of course, the collection plates are passed around. When a wish has not been granted after nine consecutive devotions, the Saint is never blamed but the sinful condition of the devotee.

Pagan numerology has attracted people from the earliest periods. The fourth-century Council of Laodicea warned: "They who are of the priesthood or of the clergy shall not be magicians, enchanters, numerologists or astrologers . . . we decree that such be cast out of the Church" (*Mansi 2, 569*). The 5th-century Christians of Africa witnessed almost daily the novena rites of pagan funerals. St. Augustine warned his flock not to imitate them because they are not biblical (*Migne, P.L. 34, 596*).

The number "nine" is certainly not a sacred number of the Christian Scriptures. The word appears only once in the New Testament and there it is far from a lucky number. When Christ had cured ten lepers, only one returned to Him to thank Him; the other "nine" never returned (*Luke 17:17*).

In the 11th century the Northern Europeans, freshly converted from paganism, tried to make their "Hubert" a patron saint for happy hunting, but their novena rites were condemned. John Beleth (12th cent.) warns that devotions on nine consecutive days are not biblical but "plainly forbidden" (*Migne, P.L. 202, 160*). Bishop Durandus (13th cent.) and Gerson (14th cent.) attack the pagan custom, but Roman Catholic authors today delight in informing their readers that these very condemnations are proof that the novena beliefs "were already widespread" (*C.E. 11, 143*).

There is no pre-Reformation document, such as a Papal Bull, Church Council or Ritual, which shows the legal origin of the pagan novena. Once it became a profitable fad, Rome tacitly approved it. At the beginning of the 18th century Pope Clement XI indirectly approved it by granting a special indulgence to the Novena of St. Joseph which could be gained only in one church of the city of Rome. By the 19th century the novena devotions became popular throughout the West.

OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL HELP

The Novena in honor of our Lady of Perpetual Help is an invention of the Redemptorist Fathers, an Order founded in the 18th century by the Italian Alfonso Maria Liguori. In 1855 the Italian Redemptorists built in Rome the magnificent church of San Alfonso, in honor of their founder. Unable to pay for it, they used a gimmick and made a national shrine out of it. In 1865 they got hold of an old Orthodox icon, a painting of Mary and the Christ child in Byzantine

style. This foreign looking picture was placed in the center of the main altar and legends were fabricated about its antiquity, its miraculous cures in the past, and, in order to explain why no one had ever heard of it, the old story of the marvelous re-discovery of the relic in 1865. In spite of its alleged antiquity, Pope Pius IX in 1866 became the first pope to approve its public veneration. It is the only Icon thus venerated in the Latin church. The official title of the miraculous Lady is: "Madonna del Perpetuo Soccorso", Our Lady of Perpetual Succor. Since in American slang this sounds too much like 'perpetual sucker', the United States calls her Our Lady of Perpetual Help.

At first the Icon could only be venerated at Rome. Later all Redemptorist churches displayed replicas of the Icon, thus drawing crowds from other churches. Finally all churches were allowed to install the Icon under certain conditions. Many American Catholics believe that Our Lady of Perpetual Help is as powerful as the European Ladies of Lourdes, Loreto and Fatima.

In order to have one's wish granted by this particular Lady, the following things are required: (1) Your church must possess an authorized reproduction of the Italian Icon. This facsimile may be purchased only from the Redemptorist Superior of the St. Alphonse Church in Rome. This fact disproves the often repeated excuse that Catholics do not worship a statue but merely use the image to concentrate their mind on one particular Saint. A church may have one hundred statues of Mary, but without this particular icon the Novena worship is in vain. (2) This replica of the painting of Mary must be officially installed in your church by the Redemptorists. Local Redemptorists will make quite a ceremonial out of this installation and are paid accordingly. This financial transaction plus the purchase price of the replica are the clues to the secret why this devotion cannot be held

before an ordinary statue of Mary. (3) Devotions to Our Lady of Perpetual Help must be held on Tuesday evenings. It would seem that on other evenings the lady is not at home or is using another name. (4) In order to have one's wish granted, one must attend the church services (with collection plates) on nine consecutive Tuesdays. If you miss one Tuesday you must start all over again.

"The picture of Our Lady of Perpetual Succor . . . is supposed to have been painted in the thirteenth century" (*C.E. 11*, 699). "Its high altar possesses a Byzantine image of unknown origin, called the Madonna del Perpetuo Soccorso" (*C.E. 13*, 170).

Instead of preaching the redemption in Christ, the Redemptorist Fathers ask their followers to put their trust in a "supposed" painting "of unknown origin".

Other Orders also have received permission to conduct novenas. The Jesuit Novena of Grace is well known in Catholic countries. "This novena is now made publicly in many countries . . . The conditions include a visit to a Jesuit church" (*C.E. 11*, 144). Why one particular brand of salvation is only obtainable in a Jesuit church, and why another brand is only available in a Redemptorist or Franciscan church is hard for the laity to understand. As a matter of fact it cannot be explained without accusing the envying and quarreling Orders of fraud and greed.

FIRST FRIDAYS

We are informed that the numerological method of receiving Communion on the First Friday of nine consecutive months is also to be attributed to the French night club dancer, Margaret Mary Alacoque. It is rather strange that Roman Catholics should eat the Lord's Supper on Fridays, on which days they are forbidden to eat meat. To believe that Communions are more powerful on a "first Friday" is

pure superstition even according to Roman Catholic standards. To believe that these First Friday Communion are still more powerful if received in nine consecutive months is about the height of all numerological superstitions.

The practice evidently originated with the confraternities meeting on the first Fridays of the month. In order to promote regular attendance the members were told of the special graces of a novena if they attended nine consecutive times without missing once. Like all new inventions which cannot be proved by Scripture or tradition, this novelty was then said to have been revealed by special miracle.

Speaking of "the first Friday of each month" (*C.E.* 9, 653) and "the Nine Fridays in honor of the Sacred Heart" (*C.E.* 12, 276), the Catholic Encyclopedia assures us that they are "based on the promise made to Blessed Margaret Mary by the Sacred Heart, assuring the grace of final perseverance and the reception of the Sacraments before death, to all who should receive Holy Communion on the first Friday of every month for nine consecutive months" (*C.E.* 11, 143).

FIRST SATURDAYS OF THE MONTH

The devotion of the first Saturday of the month originated so late that the Catholic Encyclopedia (1907) had never heard of it. It is based on the apparition of Mary to three children of Fatima, Portugal. To obtain the grace of salvation one must receive Communion on the First Saturday of the month and recite the Rosary. "First Saturdays devotions had its origin in the promise of Mary at Fatima in 1917 to obtain the graces necessary to salvation" (*National Cath. Almanac*, 1955, p. 286). The miracle of our Lady of Fatima was reported in the American newspapers in 1940, thirty-three years after its alleged occurrence.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

STATIONS OF THE CROSS

DID THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS ORIGINATE BEFORE THE REFORMATION?

Today, every Roman Catholic church of the Western Rite has the Fourteen Stations of the Cross. These 'stations' are fourteen pictures or sculptures depicting the suffering and death of Christ. They are placed in or on the walls throughout the church building. Today, every Roman Catholic can make an imaginary pilgrimage through the Holy Land (Palestine) by making the "Way of the Cross" (Via crucis) in his own church. By slowly walking through the side aisles, visiting each station, making a genuflection and reciting a few prayers, one can gain the same indulgences as the pilgrims of the Middle Ages who actually visited the various shrines of the Holy Land.

1095 Pope Urban II granted the first indulgence to the first crusaders who sought to rescue the Holy Land from the Turks. This indulgence applied only to the pardon of priest-imposed penances and could only be gained by adult, male soldiers engaged in the invasion of Palestine.

- 1342 The Holy Land Indulgence became a Franciscan monopoly when Pope Clement VI bestowed on the Franciscan Order the guardianship of Palestine. This pope was the "gay" Benedictine monk whose mistress, according to the contemporary Villani, was Countess of Tyrenne, and whose papal court at Avignon, France, was "a sink of iniquity" according to Petrarch. He had obtained the papacy with the support of the Franciscans and gave them the guardianship of the Holy Land which became the richest benefice on earth.
- 1342-1862 All indulgences attached or related to the Holy Land remained a Franciscan monopoly.
- 1520 After Martin Luther had exposed the racket of indulgences, and Roman Catholics began to object to the long and dangerous pilgrimages to Palestine (months away from wife and family), Pope Leo X granted the Franciscans the privilege of erecting a 'Little Palestine' Shrine in Antwerp, Belgium, where Western European pilgrims could gain the same indulgences as those gained in Asia.
- 1686 Pope Innocent XI granted the rich Franciscans the privilege of erecting Little Palestine shrines within the walls of every Franciscan monastery for the use of Franciscan monks only. The laity and monks of other Orders still had to travel to Palestine or Antwerp to gain the same indulgence.
- 1726 Pope Benedict XIII granted all Roman Catholics the Holy Land indulgences when they visited a shrine of the Franciscan Order.
- 1731 When other Orders protested this monopoly of salvation, Pope Clement XII was forced to allow the erecting of Holy Land Shrines in all monasteries and parishes. However, the erection of such shrines needed the permission (fee) of the Franciscan Order.

- 1742 Pope Benedict XIV recommended the erection of Holy Land Stations in all churches, but priests objected to the Franciscan fees.
- 1800 Austria, for example, did not have a single Station of the Cross in its churches until the Archbishop of Vienna rewarded the Franciscans for the privilege of having them installed in his cathedral. This particular shrine had eleven stations. The Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "Only five of these correspond exactly with our Stations" (*C.E.* 15, 570).
- 1857 After a century of protest, the Roman Catholics of Protestant England finally obtained permission from Rome to erect Stations without having to hire the Franciscan monks.
- 1862 Pope Pius IX was finally forced to allow all of continental Europe to erect Stations without permission of the Franciscan Order. This is the end of the Franciscan monopoly. The Catholic Encyclopedia sighs: "The last restriction was removed" (*C.E.* 15, 571).

It was not until 1890 that the smaller parish churches began to install the Stations of the Cross. Often the donors of the Stations (some members of the parish) received the privilege of posing for the Roman soldiers under the Cross, thereby having their faces perpetuated in the painting. There are some old folks living today who remember when the Stations were first installed in their parish church.

Because of the papal blunder of Pope Innocent XI in 1686 of granting to the Stations "all" indulgences that have "ever" been granted throughout the centuries to the visitors of the Holy Land, Rome is embarrassed today by the inconsistency that Roman Catholics can now gain within five minutes hundreds of indulgences which once required many life times. Rome further refuses to explain to her priest students that the earliest Holy Land indulgences were simple pardons

from man-imposed penances (confession box) and were not the modern pardons from the God-imposed punishment of Purgatory (Particular Judgment). By church edict Catholic seminaries are forbidden to teach the priest students how many indulgences are attached to the Stations, and if a priest by private study should discover the answer he is forbidden to divulge it to his people.

A murderer, for example, who confesses his crime to a priest and who receives a penance of reciting the Rosary daily for seven years straight, can fulfill his entire penance within five minutes by making the Stations of the Cross in church. Pope Urban II in the Council of Clermont (1095) granted this indulgence when he said: "Let this journey be counted in lieu of ALL penance (pro omni poenitentia)" (*Mansi* 20, 816). The murderer could even hire his son to say the Stations for him, because Pope Nicholas IV in 1291 granted full pardon to the parents of the crusaders.

"The Instructions of the Sacred Congregation, approved by Clement XII in 1731, prohibit priests and others from specifying what or how many indulgences may be gained" (*C.E.* 15, 571). Contrary to the Bible (Eph. 2:8) Roman Catholics must work out their own salvation, but they are not allowed to know how much they have gained. Thus Rome still tries to hide the medieval frauds and stubbornly continues her system of indulgences, though she knows that the Western indulgence market is illegal in origin and unknown in the East.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Latin collections of original sources may be found in one or another of the following American universities: Berkeley, Calif.; Chicago University; Newberry Library, Chicago; Urbana, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; etc.)

- ALBERT THE GREAT, d. 1280, *Opera omnia*; Paris, 1890, Münster, 1958.
- ALEXANDER III, POPE (ROLAND), d. 1181, *Die Sentenzen Rolands*; Freiburg, 1891.
- ALEXANDER OF HALES, d. 1245, *Summa Theologica*; Florence, 1928.
- ALZOG, FATHER JOHN, d. 1878, *Universal Church History*; Cincinnati, 1903. 3 vols.
- ANTONINUS, ARCHBISHOP, d. 1459, *Summa Theologica*; Verona, 1740. 4 vols.
- AQUINAS, *see* Thomas Aquinas.
- BALTIMORE CATECHISM, No. 3; Buffalo, N.Y., 1933.
- BARONIUS, CARDINAL, d. 1607, *Annales Ecclesiastici*; Toulouse, 1869. 38 vols.
- BONAVENTURA, d. 1274, *Opera omnia*; Florence, 1832. 11 vols.
- BREVIARIUM ROMANUM; Turin, 1939. 4 vols.
- BRODERICK, ROBERT C., *Catholic Layman's Book of Etiquette*; St. Paul, 1956.
- BULLARIUM ROMANUM; Rome, 1733-1857; Turin, 1857-1885. 51 vols.
- CANUS, BISHOP MELCHIOR, d. 1560, *Opera*; Cologne, 1605.
- CATHERINE OF SIENA, d. 1380, *Epistole*; Milan, 1842.
- CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA; New York, 1907. 16 vols.
- CLEMENT XIV, POPE, d. 1774, *Breve de Clemente XIV*; Madrid, 1773.
- CONWAY, FATHER B., *Question Box*; New York, 1929.
- DENZINGER, FATHER HENRY, d. 1883, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*; Freiburg, 1908; *Sources of Catholic Dogma*; London, 1957.
- DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA (Spanish Catechism); Manila, 1593.
- DOESWYCK, PETER J., *Catholic Victory in America*; Long Beach, 1960; *Ecumenicalism and Romanism*; Long Beach, Calif., 1961.
- DREVES, FATHER GUIDO, d. 1909, *Analecta Hymnica*; Leipzig, 1888. 51 vols.
- DURANDUS, BISHOP WILLIAM, d. 1296, *Rationale*; Venice, 1568.

- FORTESCUE, FATHER ADRIAN, d. 1923, *History of the Mass*; London, 1917.
- HENRY BRADSHAW SOCIETY OF ENGLAND, *Rare Liturgical Texts*; London, 1891-1934. 73 vols.
- HURTER, FATHER HUGO von, b. 1832, ed., *Sanctorum Patrum opuscula selecta*; 1879. 54 vols.
- ISIDORE, BISHOP, d. 636, *Opera omnia*; Paris, 1850. 3 vols.
- JOASAPH, ARCHBISHOP, d. 1437, *Canonical Answers*; Odessa, 1903.
- JUGIE, FATHER MARTIN, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium*; Paris, 1926-1935. 5 vols.
- LATOURETTE, K. S. (Protestant), *History of Christianity*; New York, 1953.
- LEFEBVRE, FATHER GASPAR, *Daily Missal*; St. Paul, Minn., 1927.
- LIBER USUALIS MISSAE ET OFFICII; Rome, 1923.
- LIVY, TITUS, d. 17, *History of Rome*; New York, 1926. 6 vols.
- MANSI, BISHOP JOHN D., d. 1769, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio*; Florence, Venice, 1758-1798. 58 folio vols.
- MARTENE, FATHER EDMOND, d. 1739, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*; Antwerp, 1763. 4 vols.
- MIGNE, FATHER JACQUES P., d. 1875, ed., *Patrologiae Latinae cursus*, and *Patrologiae Graecae cursus*; Paris, 1844-1857. 473 volumes (in nearly every American university).
- MIRBT, CARL TH., b. 1860, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstthums*; Leipzig, 1895; Tübingen, 1934.
- MISSALE ROMANUM; Regensburg, 1924.
- NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC (annual).
- NEWMAN, CARDINAL JOHN H., d. 1890, *Development of Christian Doctrine*; London, 1878; New York, 1949.
- OMAHA CATHOLIC DIOCESE, *Statuta Diocesana*; Omaha, 1934.
- POULET, FATHER CHARLES, *History of the Catholic Church*; St. Louis, 1939. 2 vols.
- PRUEMMER, FATHER D. M., *Vademecum Theologiae Moralis*; Freiburg, 1923.
- RAYMOND OF PENAFORT, c. 1235, *Summa*; Paris, 1720.
- RITUALE ROMANUM; Rome, 1926.
- ROLAND, *see* Alexander III.
- STUBBS, WILLIAM, *Select Chapters*; Oxford, 1900.
- THOMAS AQUINAS, d. 1274, *Summa Theologica* (English text); London, 1928. 22 vols.
- WEDGE, M. F., *You and your Patron Saints*; St. Paul, 1955.

CORRIGENDA

The Ever Changing Church (vol. 2)

- page 23, line 7: Poitiers
- page 43, line 11: intelligitur
- page 58, line 7: "From
- page 62, line 17: Britain
- page 69, line 22: Lyons instead of Tours
- page 77, line 18: (d. 1141) not 1147
- page 113, line 18: omit quotation marks
(Migne, P.L. 9, 523)
- page 145, line 24: Nacedah